DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 922 VT 006 504

WORKSHOP ON JOB DEVELOPMENT FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS (NEW YORK, N. Y., JUNE 14-15, 1967). MANPOWER TRAINING SERIES.

New York Univ., N.Y. Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth.
Spons Agency-Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training (DOL), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Jun 67
Note-109p.
Available from-Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, 853 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003 ($1.00).
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.44
Descriptors-CONFERENCE REPORTS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, *EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS, *EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES (JOBS), GOVERNMENT ROLE, *JOB DEVELOPMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT, WORKSHOPS
Identifiers-Chicago, Illinois, Missouri, New York City, St. Louis, *Workshop on Job Development for Disadvantaged Youth

In an effort to improve job development efforts to cope with the hard core unemployed, 73 representatives of government agencies, industry, non-profit organizations, Congress, and the Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth met for a workshop. Major panel topics were: (1) Job Development--Where Are We Now? (2) Job Development and the Civil Service, (3) Community Experience in Job Development Programs, and (4) New Dimensions to Job Development. Some presentations were: (1) "Job Development for Disadvantaged Youth, Basic Issues," by F. Cassell, (2) "Job Development and the Labor Market," by R. A. Nixon, (3) "Federal Civil Service and Job Development," by S. Leff, (4) "Job Development in St. Louis," by C. Gatlin, (5) "Industry Approaches to Job Development," by W. Flynn, (6) "The Chicago Job Development Experience," by F. W. Bezanson, (7) "Job Development as a Social Problem," by R. Schrank, (8) "New Dimensions in Job Development," by S. Levitan, and (9) "After Watts," by M. Dymally. A majority of the participants favored removal of artificial barriers to employment and large-scale subsidies to employers to spur the hiring of disadvantaged clients as solutions to employment problems. Discussion by conference participants is reported. (DM)

C.1

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS: WORKSHOP ON JOB DEVELOPMENT FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

ED022922

VT006504

MANPOWER TRAINING SERIES

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK • NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

New York University
Graduate School of Social Work
Alex Rosen, Dean

•

Center For The Study of Unemployed Youth
Stanley Sadofsky, Director
Melvin Herman, Associate Director

•

Institutes and Curriculum Development Project
R. A. Nixon, Director
Maurice Mezoff, Associate Director

•

853 Broadway
New York, New York 10003

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:
WORKSHOP ON

JOB DEVELOPMENT FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JUNE 14-15, 1967
New York, N. Y.

This publication is part of a project conducted by the Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth of the Graduate School of Social Work of New York University under a grant provided by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare to develop curriculum materials for program planners and operators.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH

PURPOSE

The Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth of the Graduate School of Social Work reflects fundamental policies of New York University to reach out and contribute to the progress and development of the community.

The Center engages in a variety of activities designed to contribute to knowledge of the multiple problems faced by unemployed youth and to assist in the planning and administration of programs for such youth. By facilitating the interaction between practitioners and academic specialists, the Center hopes to improve understanding and skill in each area of concern resulting from the unemployment of young people. The activities of the Center are supported with funds provided by New York University, The Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the U.S. Department of Labor.

PROGRAM

Research. The Center is currently completing a three-year study of changes in work attitudes and performance of youth enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in New York City.

Curriculum Materials. The Center develops training materials primarily through workshops and institutes, participated in by planners and operators of youth-work programs among federal, regional, state and community agencies. The curriculum materials are intended to serve the training needs of personnel engaged in youth-work programs at all levels.

Technical Assistance. The Center offers technical assistance in the planning, operation and assessment of Comprehensive Employment Programs and Scheuer nonprofessional programs for selected metropolitan areas.

Training. The Center designs and conducts training programs for staff personnel of the Bureau of Work Programs.

FOREWORD

Job development, the providing of satisfactory work opportunities for the disadvantaged, has been from the beginning an important component of local manpower programs and governmental labor market services. indeed, it is considered the end reason for all the multiple efforts, both public and private, at upgrading worker employability, and improving the functioning of the job market. The heavy and persuasive emphasis on job and vocational training in government sponsored manpower programs testifies to the general agreement on the priority of adjustments to the supply-side, rather than the demand-side, of the labor market.

Yet the incidence and duration of joblessness, concentrated among the urban slum disadvantaged, and its unresponsiveness to most current remedial measures, have promoted renewed attention to questions of employment potential in the American economy.

This emphasis has been heightened by the growing public awareness that even graduates of existing work training programs encounter substantial difficulties in gaining, or renewing, secure ties in the labor market. As Senator Tydings (D. Md.) stated:

> "Too often, today, the Federal job training programs do not lead readily to job opportunities. Too often, a youngster completing a Job Corps or Neighborhood Youth Corps program finds himself with no real prospect that he can find a job to use his new skills. We cannot afford to take youngsters who already feel disillusioned about, and cheated by, our affluent society, and train them for jobs which do not exist or jobs for which they will not be hired. The Federal job training programs offer great promises. We must make sure that those promises are kept."*

Thus the theme of the workshop focused on the extent and efficacy of job development efforts to cope with the huge number of "hard to place" youth and others who remain unemployed and underemployed. In his introductory remarks, Stanley Sadofsky, Director of the Center noted:

> "We really don't require very much justification for talking about this issue, since obviously it is the reason for all of our manpower programs. But it is also clear to us . . . that job development constitutes a real problem for those with this responsibility in local

---

* Statement to the U.S. Senate on Introduction of "Federal Government Employment Opportunity Act," **Congressional Record**, March 22, 1967.

> areas. We are told that program operators, who would like to be able to offer their trainees a decent choice of acceptable job alternatives are in fact unable to do so. That in a tight labor market, there are a number of jobs that are available, but are not regarded as decent or acceptable to the trainees themselves."

Both Mr. Sadofsky and Dr. Nixon, Director of the Center's Curriculum Development Project, stressed the relevance of the larger issues of full employment, racial barriers by employers and unions, and the exodus of industry from inner cities, to the effectiveness of job development activities.

The two-day workshop was organized into four session topics, each of which began with brief presentations by invited experts in the various areas. The speakers did not prepare formal papers, but were asked to identify some of the chief issues raised by the session topic, and to use their presentations to stimulate discussions. The four session topics were:

(1) Job Development — Where Are We Now?
(2) Job Development and the Civil Service
(3) Community Experience in Job Development Programs
(4) New Dimensions to Job Development

The workshop was structured to provide a maximum of candid give-and-take among the participants, without the pressures of passing resolutions or deciding upon specific recommendations. The 65 invited participants represented a variety of public and private institutions concerned with employment, job development and the labor market. About 55 percent were federal, state and local government specialists; 29 percent were staff members of private profit and non-profit organizations; the remainder, including Center staff, came from New York University.

While no specific recommendations emerged from the workshop, as part of an evaluation procedure during the sessions, the Center asked participants for an expression of opinion on several basic issues emerging from the job development theme. Because various alternative measures have been advanced as a solution to the employment problems of the disadvantaged, the Center asked the specialists, at the end of the workshop, to rank such approaches in order of relative importance to them. As shown in the tabulation below, the participants significantly saw removal of artificial employment barriers (e.g., race, arrest records, etc.) as a major asset to job development efforts for the disadvantaged, whereas nearly two participants out of five considered that general expansionary

Chief Measures to Reduce Disadvantaged Joblessness to the Prevailing National Rate

a) General Economic expansion*	38%
b) Upgrade supply of Disadvantaged Manpower	18%
c) Improving Labor Market Efficiency	5%
d) Removing All Artificial Barriers to Employment	52%

policies, aimed at 3% unemployment economy would be needed to accomplish this goal.

The choice of large-scale subsidies to employers to spur the hiring of disadvantaged clients appeared to enjoy a decisive edge (62%) over alternative choices, such as "New Careers" program in public services (31%), and making government a "last resort employer" (17%).

The conference proceedings summarized below are based upon major excerpts from the taped transcript of the workshop sessions, edited to emphasize the major issues raised in the presentations and discussions.

The Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth conducted the workshop as part of its Curriculum Development Project, sponsored by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

---

* Fifty-four percent of the participants ranked this measure as second most important. Choice of more than one makes it possible to have more than 100%.

CONTENTS

A. **FOREWORD** 2

B. **WORKSHOP AGENDA** 9

C. **LIST OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS** 11

D. **PROCEEDINGS** 16

I Job Development for Disadvantaged Youth — Basic Issues

Remarks of Mr. Frank Cassell: 16
    "JOB DEVELOPMENT — WHERE ARE WE NOW?" 16
Selection Problems 16
Strategies of Job Development 18
    Job Development Problems 19
    Successful Job Placement 19
    Role of Employer Personnel 20
Small Business and Job Development 21
Community-wide Strategy 21
Industry-wide Strategy 22

Remarks of Dr. R. A. Nixon
    "JOB DEVELOPMENT AND THE LABOR MARKET" 23
Growth of the Labor Force 24
Progress in Job Development 24
The Unemployment Rate and Job Development 25
Areas for Job Development 26
    Discrimination in Employment 26
    Other Barriers 27
    Restructuring Jobs 27
    Job Creation 28

DISCUSSION

Issues in Selection 28
Significance of the Unemployment Rate 31
    Adequacy of Unemployment Measures 32
Issues in Developing Jobs 33
    The Watts Experience 34
Issues in the Private Sector 35
    Discrimination in Hiring 37

II JOB DEVELOPMENT AND THE CIVIL SERVICE

Remarks of Mr. Sam Leff

"FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE SERVICE DEVELOPMENT" 40
  Identification of Job Openings 40
  The "MUST" Program 41
  The Hiring Process 42
  Disseminating Information 43

Remarks of Mr. Solomon Hoberman

"NEW YORK CITY CIVIL SERVICE AND JOB DEVELOPMENT" 43
  Job Development Programs 44
  Job Development and Skill Shortages 46
  Special Problems 46

DISCUSSION

Problems of Change in Civil Service 47
  Change in Response to Community Need 47
  Changes in Civil Service Procedures 49
The Tydings Bill and Civil Service Jobs 51
Gaps in Training Resources 54
Problems in Job Restructuring 55
Impact of Job Development on Civil Service 56
Summary 58

III COMMUNITY EXPERIENCE IN JOB DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Remarks of Mr. Curtis Gatlin

"JOB DEVELOPMENT IN ST. LOUIS" 59
  The Program 59
  Major Gaps 60

Remarks of Mr. William F. X. Flynn

"INDUSTRY'S APPROACH TO JOB DEVELOPMENT". 60
  The "STEP" Program 61
  Other New Programs 62

Remarks of Mr. Fred W. Bezanson

"THE CHICAGO JOB DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE". 64
  New Approaches 64

Staff Education 65
Utilization of Community Resources 65

Remarks of Mr Robert Schrank
"JOB DEVELOPMENT AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM" 67
The Focus of the Problem 68
Methods for Change 69
Other Approaches 71

DISCUSSION

Job Development Approaches 72
Influence vs. Power 75
Barriers in Hiring 75
Strategies for Change 77
Problems of Industry in Job Development 80
Private vs. Public Employment Potential 82
"Double Standards" and Minority Hiring 82
The View of the Disadvantaged 84

IV NEW DIMENSIONS IN JOB DEVELOPMENT

Remarks of Dr. Sar Levitan 85
Dimensions for Full Employment 86
Government as Employer of Last Resort 87
New Dimensions 87
Discrimination Problems 87
Income Maintenance Plus Part-Time Work 88
Subsidy for Employers 88

Remarks of Senator Mervyn M. Dymally
"AFTER WATTS" 89
Self Help 90
State Legislative Role 90
Ghetto Job Access 91
New Careers Role 91
Private Industry's Role 91
Role of Unions 91
Role of Present Institutions 91

DISCUSSION

A Basic Philosophy 92
    The Role of Planning 93
    Goals of Job Development 93
Employer Training Insurance 94
Dimensions for Upward Mobility 95
Social Planning 97
    Inadequate Resources 98
    Manpower and Redevelopment 98
    The Potential of The Public Sector 99
Changes in Urban Centers 100
The Problem of Public Transportation 101
Employer of Last Resort 102

WORKSHOP AGENDA

Carnegie Endowment International Center
345 East 46th Street, New York City

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 1967

1:30 PM - 5:00 PM

Session I — "Job Development — Where Are We Now?"

Chairman: Stanley Sadofsky, Director
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth

Panelists: Frank H. Cassell, Director
U.S. Employment Service
U.S. Department of Labor

Dr. R. A. Nixon, Director
Institutes and Curriculum Development
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth

DISCUSSION

7:00 PM - 10:00 PM

Session II — "Job Development and The Civil Service"

Chairman: Dr. Alex Rosen, Dean
Graduate School of Social Work
New York University

Panelists: Sam Leff, Chief
Standards Division
U.S. Civil Service Commission

Solomon Hoberman,
Director of Personnel
New York City

DISCUSSION

Discussion Leader: Samuel Ganz, Commissioner
of Manpower
Manpower and Career
Development Agency
New York City Human Resources
Administration

THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 1967

9:00 AM - 12:30 PM

Session III — "Community Experience in Job Development Programs"

Chairman: Maurice W. Mezoff, Associate Director
Institutes and Curriculum Development
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth

Panelists: Curtis Gatlin, Director Works Program
St. Louis Human Development Corp.

William F. X. Flynn, Director STEP Program
National Association of Manufacturers, Inc.

Fred W. Bezanson, Director
Urban Planning, Chicago Metropolitan YMCA

Robert Schrank, Director
Neighborhood Youth Corps
New York City Human Resources Administration

DISCUSSION

1:30 PM - 5:00 PM

Session IV — "New Dimension in Job Development"

Chairman: Dr. R. A. Nixon, Director
Institutes and Curriculum Development
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth

Panelists: Dr. Sar Levitan
National Manpower Policy Task Force

Honorable Mervyn M. Dymally
California State Senate

DISCUSSION

LIST OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Name	Organization
Alex Altheim	State Employment Service New York City
Robert Andrews	Opportunities Industrialization Corporation Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Stanley Aronowitz	Human Resources Administration New York City
Samuel Bector	U.S. Employment Service for District of Columbia Washington, D.C.
Samuel Bernstein	St. Louis Human Development Corporation St. Louis, Missouri
Fred W. Bezanson	Chicago Metropolitan YMCA Chicago, Illinois
Minnie Blackman	Youth Opportunity Center New York City
Gwendolyn Bullock	Department of Housing and Urban Development Washington, D.C.
Robert Burt	Staff, Senator Tydings Washington, D.C.
Samuel Burt	U.S. Employment Service Department of Labor Washington, D.C.
Frank H. Cassell	U.S. Employment Service Department of Labor Washington, D.C.
Bruce Cole	YMCA — JOBS NOW Chicago, Illinois
Joseph Collins	OMPER U.S. Department of Labor Washington, D.C.

Name	Organization
Janet Cowings	Bureau of Employment Security U.S. Department of Labor Washington, D.C.
Daniel E. Diamond	Department of Economics New York University New York City
Lorraine Dresel	Office of Probation New York City
Hon. Mervyn M. Dymally	California State Senate Sacramento, California
Virginia Flanagan	West Virginia State Employment Service Charleston, West Virginia
William F. X. Flynn	National Association of Manufacturers, Inc. New York City
Joseph Freitas, Jr.	Bay Area Urban League, Inc. San Francisco, California
Rubin Friedman	Region II, U.S. Employment Service New York City
Samuel Ganz	Human Resources Administration New York City
Curtis R. Gatlin	St. Louis Human Development Corporation St. Louis, Missouri
D. Donald Glover	Bureau of Work Programs U.S. Department of Labor Washington, D.C.
Arnold Harris	Community Relations Service Department of Justice Washington, D.C.
Herbert Harris	Action for Bridgeport Community Development, Inc. Bridgeport, Connecticut
Solomon Hoberman	Department of Personnel New York City

Name	**Organization**
Walter Hooke	United Parcel Service, Inc. New York City
Truman Jacques	California State Employment Service Los Angeles, California
Edward Jones	Mobilization for Youth, Inc. New York City
Roslyn D. Kane	Office of Economic Opportunity Washington, D.C.
Fred M. Karches	Work Opportunities Unlimited, Inc. St. Louis, Missouri
Sam Leff	Standards Division U.S. Civil Service Commission Washington, D.C.
Saul Leshner	Jewish Employment and Vocational Service Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Sar Levitan	National Manpower Policy Task Force Washington, D.C.
Ray Lewis	Department of Housing and Urban Development Washington, D. C.
Daniel Lowery	U.S. Employment Service Department of Labor Washington, D.C.
Ruth Maitland	Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Department of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D.C.
Joseph Marci	Community Progress, Inc. New Haven, Connecticut
George McQuoid	Region II, Civil Service Commission New York City
Michael Miller	Deputy Director State Employment Service New York City

Name	**Organization**
Thomas Miller	Youth Opportunity Center Newark, New Jersey
Harold K. Montross	Bureau of Employment Security U.S. Department of Labor Washington, D.C.
Arnold Nemore	National Manpower Policy Task Force Washington, D.C.
Benjamin Oill	Department of Personnel New York City
Findlay Petrie	U.S. Employment Service Department of Labor Washington, D.C.
George Polansky	Arrow Tool Company, Inc. Weathersfield, Connecticut
Philip Prince	Sears Roebuck, Inc. Chicago, Illinois
Percival Punter	Region II, Bureau of Employment Security New York City
Robert W. Ralph	Department of Economic Opportunity Suffolk County, Patchogue, Long Island
Clark G. Roberts	JOBS NOW Project Chicago, Illinois
Alex Rosen	Graduate School of Social Work New York University New York City
Sumner Rosen	State, County and Municipal Employees Union (AFL-CIO) New York City
Max S. Saslow	Department of Personnel New York City
Robert Schrank	Human Resources Administration New York City
Bruno Stein	Institute of Labor Relations New York University New York City

Name	**Organization**
Albert Ternanova	New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity Trenton, New Jersey
Emanuel Tobier	Regional Plan Association, Inc. New York City

STAFF

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH

Stanley Sadofsky
Melvin Herman
R. A. Nixon
Maurice W. Mezoff
Neale Clapp
Robert Lilienfeld
Jack Mansfield
Kit Manos

Michael Munk
Leonard Miller
Delores Harris
Charles Soffel
Larry Houston
Ronald Perrin
Alvin Mickens

PROCEEDINGS

I. JOB DEVELOPMENT FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH — BASIC ISSUES

Chairman: Mr. Stanley Sadofsky

Remarks of Mr. Frank Cassell

"Job Development — Where Are We Now?"

I'm reminded that not too long ago, a newspaper reporter asked about the slums and the ghettoes, and it occured to me that these were the great underdeveloped nations within our nation.

I tend to think of the people that we'll be talking about over the next couple of days as disadvantaged because they're underdeveloped, but in this connotation, I'd like to think there's a lot of potential that hasn't been tapped. Potential that could be brought out under the right circumstances, opportunity to youth who, when given the chance to develop, can produce. I'd like to start out on an optimistic note about all I've seen of so-called disadvantaged youth, or underdeveloped youth. It is we, who are supposed to be helping them, who are disadvantaged, because I think we lack the talent, the skills, the empathy and the understanding that it takes.

I'm going to talk a little bit from an employer's standpoint, whether it's a public employer or a private employer, to get the discussion under way.

Selection Problems

I think the first thing that one has to realize is that in the training of people for leadership in business, or even in government, we emphasize from the very beginning the selection of "the fittest," by whatever means or devices available, whether we're selecting college professors, or business executives. Everybody seems to want the "fittest," as they define it.

This is especially true of the training of personnel men in industry. It is less true of a lot of our personnel in the employment services, who very often tend to reflect some of the thinking of industry. The training in the business schools offers very little to prepare a business executive or a personnel man in coping with any conditions, other than selecting the "fittest."

As a matter of fact, the whole award system in our society is designed essentially to select **out** people, or eliminate people, not in include them in.

In industry, in particular, we get executives from several different sources: engineering schools, where this subject is never discussed; or in business schools, where the subject is discussed just a little bit, but always in terms of employment of the most capable and the "fittest." I might say in this connection, that one of your graduate business schools with 750 students here in New York just two years ago had only one Negro. When I talked to the Dean of that business school about making it possible for more Negroes to enter, he said he just couldn't lean over backwards in selecting people for the business school.

I asked this question in light of the fact that the Business School of the University of Chicago is doing precisely that, showing that it is possible to make this sort of thing work.

Thus, the private sector and a good part of the public sector, is composed of people trained to eliminate people. Very often in the elimination of people, education is used as a screen. It's probably the simplest of all elimination devices. You don't have to do a bit of thinking. All you have to know is that an applicant did not complete high school; then you can rule the person out. Secondly, testing along with the interview as a screening device, very often has never been validated in such a way that it relates to actual job performance. Frequently cut-off scores are simply a means, like the education requirement, for easily eliminating large numbers of people.

Another consideration from the employer's standpoint is the matter of supply and demand. If there is in fact a six percent or seven percent unemployment rate, the employer, very logically, is going to try to get the most for his money. And the most for his money is the person with the highest skills and qualifications.

There is also a feeling on the part of employers that a company or an organization can succeed only if it has talented people. There tends to be a stereotype that people from disadvantaged backgrounds are not talented.

Now this workshop, I think, is concerned with a new idea, the idea of **more** than "equal opportunity," the idea of including everybody in our opportunity system. The fact is that neither the public nor the private sector is equipped adequately to cope with everyone. The training we received was how to work with people who are well trained when we get them, people who are not essentially disadvantaged but rather have all the advantages, people who have been selected out a half a dozen times before we ever see them. We see the cream.

In our kind of system, we have much more experience in dealing with the easy problems than with the difficult ones. This is fully as true of the corporation staff as it is of the government staff. And this has a profound effect upon institutions, whether they're public or private. It simply means one has to turn himself inside out, and do things that he never did before.

His tools no longer apply; the tests that he thought were useful are not; the idea of sorting out or eliminating individuals on the basis of education is no longer useful; the whole notion of how to work with people who are quite different in terms of the disadvantages they have had is alien to most of our institutions.

There's a complicating factor; I call it the oversimplification approach. It's very easy for the head of a company, or of a government agency, to sign an Equal Opportunity Pledge and say he's all for it, etc. The problem, however, is how to implement it at the operational levels.

There's going to be, I suspect, some real discussion here about the communications gaps that exist between the top of an organization and its operational levels, which very often causes a breakdown in the whole effort to develop jobs for "the disadvantaged."

Strategies of Job Development

I'd like to talk for a moment about some strategies of job development.

A strategy has been slowly evolving in the big business area. One of the steps in that strategy has been the institution known as the Plans for Progress. Plans for Progress is a device essentially to change attitudes with impact to the whole idea of "equal opportunity." Seeing some of the people from Chicago down here reminds me of the day that we tried to get going on the JOBS NOW project. Somebody suggested that we call in the Plans for Progress people. But someone else said, "No, you can't do that, all they believe in is equal opportunity; we've got to have somebody who believes in **unequal** opportunity."

But the point here is that Plans for Progress relative to the big corporation, is one of the minimum first steps on the road to dealing with the problems of the disadvantaged young person. It is a means for getting people to think about the problems and for going on record that they're moving toward equality of opportunity.

This, in turn, has spawned some useful devices: Equal Opportunity Councils are emerging in various cities of the United States. Again I think that as this seminar unfolds, we'll find that institutions like the local Equal Opportunity Councils of various cities will become a part of the strategy of job development.

I'd like to mention that the JOBS NOW project in Chicago grew out of the Equal Opportunity Council. Now each of these is a successful step in involvement.

In Plans for Progress, it's very easy to get signed up on a piece of paper. In Equal Opportunity Councils of the cities you've got to be involved to the extent that your going out talking to people about the subject. In the JOBS NOW type of involvement, you move one step further toward the actual employment of disadvantaged people in jobs.

Job Development Problems

As an employer, I've been on the "receiving end" of hundreds of job developers, who knock on my door and seek my help in getting jobs. It's a pretty sad performance from two standpoints: one is that the man who knocks on my door doesn't know his product, that is, he doesn't know the fellow he's trying to bring in for a job; he doesn't really understand him and therefore can't sell his advantages; secondly, he doesn't know **me** as an employer, **doesn't know you as an employer.** What we've learned from this is that the new way of thinking about job development is not just dumping people, not just producing a system of successive failure, both for the individual and the employer, but a means of producing success for both the employer and the individual.

I suspect we've lost many American employers because we gave them a lot of experience in failure. Employers are not sociologists or psychologists, and when they see failure in this area they really don't know how to cope with it. I think the big new development in job development is producing a system which insures on every contact, every effort to put a disadvantaged person to work. It insures success for that individual and assures success for the company. That is how to place more people.

Successful Job Placement

I list here three or four things. The first is job readiness. We can talk about innumerable industries and their variations, and innumerable government agencies and the variations within agencies. I think we can put two, three, or four common denominators here that an employer looks for, which I think we collectively are in a position to do something about.

I think we can do something about job readiness. This means giving an individual minimum survival skills. One of these is to enable him to handle an interview, another is to enable him to groom himself properly, another is to be aware of the pitfalls of credit which may lead him into having a garnishment on his check — one of the sure ways of losing a job — in short, real preparation as to what a job, or a job environment is like.

There is a tremendous job adjustment problem from a slum condition, or a ghetto environment to the highly ordered environment of an office or a factory. There is quite a difference.

I do know this about Amreican Indians, for example. They have a little trouble adjusting to the eight-hour day; when they're supposed to come in to work at eight o'clock in the morning, they get there at three in the afternoon. This causes some problems between the Indian and the employers; but it suggests the probelm of job adjustment.

Job adjustment is a two-way thing. We have thought about the problem of adjusting workers to the environment, but we've also got to think about that environment, and what we can do about **it.**

The other day I needled an employer with a statement like this. He was telling me that he wanted some research money to determine how to adjust the worker to the environment. I said, well, how about some research money to adjust the environment to the worker?

I think I sufficiently upset him that he blurted out: "How can I do anything about my white foreman who hates Negroes with a passion." The point is that in the "new job development," we have to think about what help we can be to an employer in solving such a problem. We've got to give him as much support as we give our clients. He simply doesn't have the tools. He needs help to be successful. He needs little cues, aids, and guides that will help him.

If, after he signs for the Plans for Progress, and takes on somebody, and is cooperating with our organizations, then we've got to help him make this thing operate. And the thing we really haven't done systematically, is produce the **support system** for both the individual and the employer **to give them both a chance to be successful.**

I'm not going to elaborate on how these support systems work, except to suggest that some kind of a relationship has to be established for the individual who goes on the job **until he has had a chance to be a success on the job.** Some kind of relationship has to be established with employers to give them help when they need it.

Role of Employer Personnel

I'd like to comment just for a moment on the roles of the personnel men and foremen in the companies and institutions with which we will deal.

The first is that the foreman has always got to get production and quality. Even though the president of the company says they're operating on the basis of equal opportunity, more often the foreman is judged on the basis of production and quality. There are hence two different standards, at least in the beginning.

This is where the support system inside the company is important, where the president or the vice-president, whoever they may be, is supporting the foreman down the line, in trying to make a go of things. The personnel man's problem is peculiarly difficult, because if he doesn't produce good people for the operations, the line organization turns away from him.

Small Business and Job Development

Now quickly to pass on to small business. This, to me, is the great untapped job resource of this country. Practically everybody who develops jobs goes after the 500 largest companies on **Fortune's** list. This results in 30 to 40 job developers, from every different organization, hitting the same company. You know the consequences of that.

The cost of developing one job with one small employer is substantially great. A couple of years ago I worked on the development of one job, a sales job, with one company. It took me eight hours of my own time, and I only got one job. It was personally rewarding, but I want to point out that we have yet to devise a system and a means of reaching the millions of American employers who are not involved even in a part of this whole system.

If we think about this, the great challenge becomes how to involve the larger corporations, the government institutions and the universities. How do we reach these employers who, if they were participating in this, could open up opportunities at a tremendous rate?

Community-Wide Strategy

Now to mention community-wide strategy, the chairman referred to CEP, the Concentrated Employment Program, the first one of which was in Cleveland, Ohio. This is a great innovation in the mobilization of total community resources, fundamentally designed to assure outcomes commensurate with the inputs of blood, sweat, tears and effort.

It means that we've been able to involve employers, the CAP's, the Employment Service, the city government and others, in a total effort to produce jobs for the disadvantaged.

Industry-Wide Strategy

Now to comment very quickly on an industry-wide strategy now in evidence in the steel industry, the farm equipment industry, the banking industry, the public utility industry, and the retail stores industry, where industry-wide agreements are now being developed for upgrading employees who may very well be classified as disadvantaged. They are on the payroll, but have no opportunity for promotion at present skill levels.

The latest agreement is one the Labor Department and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare signed with the steel industry recently to upgrade 1600 men and women in the very low job grades to higher job grades. This opens opportunities at the bottom of the job-grade system, and offers the means for developing jobs and upgrading people simultaneously.

Now a couple of things about coping with the employer. If I had any suggestion at all, it is that the job developer must level with the employer. He must be courageous enough to tell the employer what he's trying to do. He must have empathy with the employer in the problem of communication, and employer limitations in coping with it. He must, hopefully, be prepared to offer him the kind of support that I suggested he needs.

He has got to deal with the employer's concern about the problems of police records, of job hopping, and of poor job performance in past work histories. Somehow he's got to be able to work with that employer on such a basis that he views the future with optimism.

People are not very clear about police records. Police records can result from sitting down on a corner in a civil rights demonstration, or they can be for more serious things. And here, it seems to me, is where one can help the employer think this through. But one has to be frank about it.

A terribly important thing about all of this is letting the employer know that other employers manage these things successfully. There's nothing like seeing an example.

Now I don't recommend that one need become philosophical about all these things with employers. But it seems to me if it comes to this, and you are talking with employers, it's important for them to come to an appreciation of the fact that unemployment, underemployment, slums, and ghettoes are cancers to any city, and that the continuation of these things are really bad for a city, and bad for the businesses. I've often said that when we look at suburbanization, there are two kinds of people who are left in the city, the very poor and the companies with very high, fixed investments. They're both caught with higher taxes and poorer schools, and all the conditions that progressively lead to urban deterioration.

Remarks of Dr. R. A. Nixon

"JOB DEVELOPMENT AND THE LABOR MARKET"

We are all, I'm sure, very much aware of the interlocking relationship of the supply and demand aspects of the labor market.

The emphasis of this workshop is on the demand side, on jobs, although this is not belittle the supply side.

There has been a tendency, I would think, to put emphasis on the supply side. It's easier to talk about it. It's easier to talk about the remedial problems of the disadvantaged person. For a variety of reasons it's more acceptable; it virtually goes along with a blame-the-poor kind of approach; and it's much more manageable. But when we get to the demand side, we get into much tougher and more touchy areas. But we want to deal with this tough and touchy area, because we think it is central, and now requires increased emphasis.

It's a tougher subject because we know so very little about it — the hiring process and the actual work process. It's almost shocking to find the wide areas of our ignorance when you get right down to questions of job and performance requirements.

Two of my associates here at New York University have addressed themselves very constructively to this particular question. Professor Stein has done a study for OMPER on the availability of local labor market information. He came up with the conclusion that, in general, it's a pretty spotty bit of information to work with.

Professor Dan Diamond, also of New York University, is in the midst of a very interesting study on what the actual job and performance requirements are for a variety of jobs. He is coming up with some very revealing and important conclusions relevant to the job development area.

The demand side is touchier because the hiring prerequisites are sacred to the employer group. This is holy land; this is sacred land; a "No Trespassing" sign is more discernable there than in almost any other area. Employers accept collective bargaining, but they don't like to accept it over hiring, or any outside interference in the hiring process.

And yet, inevitably, this is something that we begin to talk about. It's a touchier subject also because you begin to come into conflict with various institutional, political and vested interests in the hiring process, and in the demand process, that we don't encounter when we try to teach a kid to read at the eighth-grade level instead of the fifth-grade level, or teach a Spanish-speaking kid English, or try to correct his eyesight. It's a problem of a different quality.

Growth of the Labor Force

So for a variety of reasons we have moved away from this area. I just want to underline something that Mr. Cassell noted about the enormous untapped potential that exists here. We have one outstanding example that we should never forget: World War II. In this period we had an extraordinary development in the American labor force. In the five years from April 1940 to April 1945, the actual labor force growth, was almost 8 million larger than that which was scientifically projected by the United States Labor Department.

If you adjust that for the growth of population, the unexpected growth of the labor force for those five years was something in excess of 11 million people. The participation rate of boys under 20 went up from 35 percent in 1940 to 57 percent in 1945, and for girls it went up from 19 percent in 1940 to 34 percent in 1945.

This is the kind of response to widened opportunities to work.

Progress in Job Development

The second point is that I think we all have a feeling that growth and genuine progress have been made over the past four or five years in this problem. And nothing that I say should belittle our appreciation of that progress. But we're interested here in concentrating on the doubts and the hang-ups; what more is needed, where do we need to go, how can we get there?

We should not want to put the emphasis of job development on the threat of riots; that's not the way we approach it. But the fact still remains, as we watch the development of these difficulties in various areas, a central point in so many of these upheavals comes out of a lack of jobs, or problems of employment.

That is true whether you are in Tampa, or Cincinnati, or Boston. I've visited places and programs throughout the country. But I always wonder what is their job development program in the aftermath of rioting. It would be well to talk about that, now, rather than later.

The Unemployment Rate and Job Development

The third point is the relevance to our problem of the present acceptance of a 4 percent unemployment rate as a benchmark.

A year ago, by and large, the decision was made in Washington, that we cannot further heat up the economy, and that 4 percent is where we stop. Yet we have 3 million unemployed. This is what economists call a trade-off between inflation and unemployment.

The result of this decision is reflected in the figures of the last year where unemployment had been dropping, but has now leveled off for a year.

Now the difference between a 3 percent and a 4 percent unemployment rate is the difference of 750,000 in the number of unemployed. So if you went down from four to three percent you would take 750,000 of these presently unemployed out of the ranks of the unemployed.

I would like to raise the question as to what kind of problem this creates for job developers. I'm concerned about it, because it suggests the possibility that, lacking a further tightening of the labor market, we may be like King Canute trying to push back the Ocean. In this instance, trying to find within the framework of a free labor market, with 3 million unemployed — jobs for the marginal people in the work force.

I found very impressive, the statement of Professor James Coburn of Yale University, who served on the President's Economic Council for some time. He wrote an intelligent, very effective piece on the relationship of the tight labor market to inflation and Negro unemployment, which lies at the heart of so much of what we're talking about. He writes:

> "The single most important step the nation could take to improve the economic position of the Negro is to operate the economy steadily at a low rate of unemployment. The Negro can benefit immensly from tightening the labor market still further to three and a half or three percent. The vast comfortable, white middle-class, who are never touched by unemployment, prefer to safeguard the purchasing power of life insurance and pension rights than to expand opportunities for the disadvantaged and the unemployed.
>
> "The connection between goals and the strife of the Negroes is no less real for being subtle. We are paying him too high a social price for avoiding creeping inflation and protecting our gold stock and our dollar, but it will not be easy to alter the national priority. The interests of the poor, the unemployed, and the Negro are underrepresented in the comfortable consensus which supports and confines current policy."

If there is justice in this observation, I think we have to ask ourselves how far can we progress in attacking employment problems of the marginal labor force, or structural unemployment, before the economy is geared to a 3 percent unemployment rate, or a 2 million jobless level. What kind of problem does this present to us? Does this suggest the need for a special attack on institutional barriers? Does it indicate the necessity for exploration of new job areas, or job creation to get beyond this problem?

Areas of Job Development

There are in this process several different areas of job development: One is what I would identify simply as opening existing jobs to previously excluded workers. It's very useful in the placing of handicapped people, such as convincing employers to use a deaf-mute, etc.

Another approach addresses itself to artificial standards, such as the arrest record, etc. And this is an important area in which we have made a great deal of progress. But there are in this category certain hang-ups which occur to me. I would just like to quickly indicate them.

Discrimination in Employment

One is that racial discrimination in employment is still a massive influence in this entire situation. The fact that an employer can put on his listing "Equal Opportunity Employer" has become almost a defect, rather than an advantage, since it can cloak a **de facto** volume of discrimination in the hiring process. I think that perhaps we need to emphasize this problem as a very real one. It remains a formidable barrier to breaking through on the job development front.

Also, the continued exclusion of minority groups from construction work remains very real. We talk about it, we cry about it, we complain about it, but it remains. Thus this huge construction industry, with over 3 million workers throughout the country, an industry in which many of the disadvantaged might be expected to have a logical and reasonable participation, remains effectively blocked off.

Some of us have been reading Model Cities applications. They address themselves importantly to urban slum redevelopment and rehabilitation. But I have yet to see one that satisfactorily came to grips with this issue. If rehabilitation work is done, I am hopeful that it will not be carried on within the ghetto area by all white building trades crews, while unemployed Negroes stand around on the street, waiting for the swimming pool to be finished.

This is a major defect in the picture, and limits one huge and important area in job development.

Other Barriers

Thirdly, government has not matched in its own operation, the requests it has made of private industry. You have to remember that total government employment reaches almost 16 million, including the military, federal, state, and local — almost 21 percent of the total working force of the country. The fact that government has not really opened up on entry level jobs, or relaxed its credential requirements, is another huge barrier to job development.

And fourth, I have a feeling that private industry, the major private employers, have not opened up their entry ranks to the disadvantaged. My feeling is that it is the small business that we've been able today to do a little business with on job development. But if you look at the job application blanks of General Electric, of General Motors, of U. S. Steel, of the telephone company — aside from certain public relations and token developments — they have not moved away from the arrest record, the high school diploma, careful checking on references, etc. This is understandable. They are sophisticated and mature companies. They have carefully developed selection processes that have worked successfully and efficiently for decades, and they are less willing than almost anyone to drastically change this picture.

I could give you many examples. I was at conference last week where I heard a very moving presentation from a representative of a major corporation about how they had addressed this problem in their community. He used the phrase: "We had a massive change of mind in the last five years on the entry job question."

And someone asked: "That's wonderful, but what change did your company make in its hiring requirements and its job applications?" He had to answer: "None whatsoever."

Restructuring Jobs

Another level of job development has to do with the restructuring of jobs. Now I've heard this phrase for a long time. I have yet to come across a single significant instance of **programmatically induced** job restructuring in the private sector. I may be given some examples at this conference. I know there is job restructuring going on, it's been going on since the industrial revolution, and it's done as company demand presses on the needs for personnel.

But to do real job restructuring so as to open up entry routes for the disadvantaged, or to redefine entry jobs, is something that is honored in the breach, with the exception, of course, of the public services and the highly important New Careers area.

I wonder if there aren't real possibilities of taking job restructuring out of theory and putting it in practice.

Job Creation

The final area of job development has to address itself to a much wider dimension, and that is the job creation area. Where do we create jobs? What is the role of area redevelopment? What is the potentiality of the government as a last resort employer?

Senator Ribicoff has a bill to establish the government as a last employer with a proposal for 2 billion dollars to be set aside for this development.

What about sheltered employment? Is there a group in this area whose needs can only be met by sheltered employment? What is the scope for assistance and subsidies to stimulate the absorption of the disadvantaged?

Is successful job development comparable to full employment? What new dimensions do we need to add to the job development program?

These are the things I'm looking forward to hearing answers to today and tomorrow.

DISCUSSION

Issues in Selection

S. LESHNER: I think we speak of industry as being expected in some way to perform some kind of social-service function to improve the individual to meet certain standards. In fact the business posture is necessarily one of making money and making a return on the investment.

The supply side involves the purpose of improving the capabilities of individuals, and we cannot really expect that the techniques of improving individuals can be transferred, or will be assumed by those who have to make money.

It seems that basically what you are talking about is, first, the economic problem of providing jobs, and secondly, the need to develop a more profound understanding of the environmental impact which precludes growth on the part of the individual.

I think our whole program is to be one of developing technology, not of developing real attitudes on the part of industry, because the attitudes would be in response to the return on capital investment.

I think the industry attitude is a readiness to make an investment in response to a successful demonstration on our part, of the productivity of disadvantaged people.

So what we're confronted with is the matter of developing a technology and reconciling two divergent disciplines that have to come together.

D. DIAMOND: If I've correctly interpreted the comment made by Dr. Leshner, I would have to disagree, to the extent that I think there is a relationship, on the demand side, between opening up job opportunities for the "underdeveloped" individual and profitability for the employer. We cannot assume that the employer has the right person in the job. We cannot assume that the hiring requirements which he has established for a particular job are rational.

You find a great range in employer hiring standards. At one end you'll find those formal and sophisticated procedures, and at the other end you'll find rather informal procedures which the employer, upon inquiry, doesn't even know how they were established. They've been passed on from employment interviewer to employment interviewer. He can't really find out why he has a given requirement.

This has been verified in both instances in the study which we are making — although it's in its preliminary phase — not only in terms of differences between employers, but on the basis of statistical correlations. Even in the formal and informal sense, employers just do not validate these requirements. They will take something, such as an educational requirement, and place it as an important selection device. Yet they will ignore something more critical to the worker's trade, such as necessary manual dexterity, as in the case of a wire worker occupation.

Employers will reject prospective employees on the basis of lack of experience, even though the job can be learned in a few weeks, or because they don't have a certain level of education. Yet they don't even bother to ascertain if the individual has manual dexterity.

So I don't think we can accept the fact that employers know what they're doing in terms of hiring requirements. I think we can suggest changes in these requirements to employers to improve their profitability, lower their turnover, and reduce their wage costs. We can say it will bring them a more stable and broader employment pool from which they can draw.

The indication has been made, and I think a valid one, that many of the labor markets for individual employers are tight because they make it so. It's a self-induced tightness in the labor market, because **they restrict themselves to a certain group of employees,** and therefore reduce their availability of choice.

G. POLANSKY: We have used psychological testing and employment screening for reasons other than those mentioned. We use them to validate training an individual. It does not eliminate him from training. However, just to eliminate selection techniques and throw the doors open is not a solution to the problem.

Yes, it increases the pool of people, but not the production of parts. I agree with your concept of different types of selection techniques, but first we have to create an internal structure to train these people.

This is the prerequisite to doing this.

D. DIAMOND: I certainly don't want to argue that employers should engage in necessarily expensive processes before we can prove that the input of this process is going to lead to a reasonable payoff. But certainly in the case, for example, of the wire worker, where all of the employers had already built-in training, this did not apply. Employers, as a matter of custom, trained their workers.

But what I'm talking about is the need to establish **reasonable priorities** in terms of selection devices, not to eliminate them, obviously. I think we're trying to get at the same thing: the best worker for the job.

R. SCHRANK: What are the values used in the employer's judgment as to who he ends up hiring?

D. DIAMOND: Well, that depends on the job, obviously. Certainly entry jobs are particularly critical. It isn't so much education, no high school diploma, as such. If we are talking about a job that has manipulative skills, then we want manual dexterity; if we are talking about a job that is sedentary, then we want an individual who can sustain himself over a long day in a monotonous job.

If we are talking about an occupation dealing with the public, then we want somebody with a reasonable personality. But we certainly don't have to give an individual a test, for example, or require him to have a high school degree, where this doesn't relate to the actual job to be performed.

T. JACQUES: Based on my experience I agree with Professor Diamond. I am definitely not saying, that an employer should relinquish his search for certain qualities, but just that the measuring devices that he uses won't suit the type of individuals with whom we're concerned.

A couple of good examples. If an employer is looking for dependability, he looks at a person's work record. But I personally know of people who work two days a week, have been doing so for the last five years who don't know the employer's last name, are paid in cash, and are very dependable.

When the employer asks if the applicant has an automobile, he is really asking can you get to my job, which are entirely two different things. With the disadvantaged community, that question put more directly would measure his requirement for being able to get to the job.

The question, have you ever been arrested, for instance. Now what does an employer mean? I think he's asking, is the applicant honest or is he a poor risk. In the case of a minority member or a disadvantaged person, a way to view that question is definitely not in terms of an arrest record, because where you live in certain instances dictates whether or not you've been arrested.

We have to look at the devices, including tests, because passing a test is no assurance that you can do a job well; it's only one indication.

R. ANDREWS: As job developers, we have to make sure that the hiring requirements are realistic. If they aren't, we cannot assume automatically that the employer set these hiring requirements as a means of discriminating against someone; there's the possibility that these hiring requirements were set up unconsciously as a result of the system as we know it. The system itself, and not the employer may be discriminatory to specific segments of the population.

Significance of the Unemployment Rate

J. COWINGS: I was intrigued by Dr. Nixon's remark that if we tightened up the labor market to get an average of possibly 3 percent unemployment rather than 4 percent, an additional 750,000 people would be employed, but if we ask the question who are the unemployed people, we find that rates among Negroes, as a group, is twice the rate for whites, double the national rate.

The rate for youth, I believe, ranges around 25 percent, and in some of our ghetto areas, it's as high as 45 percent.

Ideally we should make everybody employable or competitive in the labor market through training, by removing unrealistic hiring requirements, etc. But granted that this should come to pass, can the economy stand full employment? Perhaps it cannot.

This means that if the economy cannot support full employment, some unemployment will always be with us. What then is the answer? Do we continue to support the unemployed through welfare and other means of public assistance, or do we make work in the public sectors?

R. KANE: We mentioned the need to create 750,000 jobs to have a 1% drop in unemployment.

I think that we should go back to look at what that figure means, because for every one million new jobs established over the past five years, only 300,000 of them reduced the unemployment rate. So to achieve a 1% drop, we need considerably more than 750,000 jobs. We need at least 2,250,000. The fact is that 70% of new jobs are filled by persons not in the labor force. They are filled not by the disadvantaged that we are talking about, but by persons re-entering the labor market, or achieving better opportunities as the labor market gets tighter.

Adequacy of Unemployment Measures

F. BEZANSON: I'd like Mr. Cassell to respond to this if he will. The unemployment rates published of the national average, I think, is a fallacy, and harmful to job development in terms of interpretation. Employers and ourselves can be lulled into a false sense of security and achievement.

In metropolitan Chicago we have a beautiful average. But the Negro unemployment rate is 9 percent over the city of Chicago, as a whole. We are not getting adequate local statistics from any source at this point that can help us. I look to the Department of Labor for that, but I believe it's inadequate.

We do have one source of information, a report published by the Urban League Research Department.

The unemployment rate in the community of Woodlawn at the present time is 27 percent. The unemployment rate in Lawndale, which I believe is the Model Cities area, is 35 percent at certain times. Both are all Negro. We have difficulty in interpreting the magnitude of the problem as long as this national average tells us that everything is going well.

F. CASSELL: In November the Labor Department surveyed, I believe, 13 slum areas in the United States — which went beyond the question of just unemployment.

We collected data on such questions as underemployment and the problem of people earning well below what might be called a poverty level. We have those reports available for the 13 major urban slums. We did it purposely to try and cope with the kind of problem you are raising.

Some subemployment rates were hair-raisers: Boston 24.2, New York-Harlem 28.6, Bedford-Stuyvesant 27.6, Philadelphia 34.2, etc. You are quite right that people do tend to get complacent with our national numbers of 3.8 or 3.7, and in metropolitan Chicago it's 2.4 now.

I would be willing to guess that the Urban League figures are not too far off. But our survey was a systematized sample. We used 1700 data collectors, pulled them out of their regular jobs and also hired indigenous people. But we are still not absolutely sure of the count.

I might say in this connection that we've been going from door to door in Anacostia — Washington's big ghetto — and we're only finding 20 percent of the people we contact are males, so I have a feeling that even some of the numbers we have gotten are undercounts.

Issues in Developing Jobs

F. KARCHES: In St. Louis one of the important questions asked by business and industry, and our influential newspapers was, exactly, who are the hard-core unemployed? Who are the "disadvantaged"? Who are the culturally disadvantaged?

Well, when job developers such as myself and my crew sit down with an executive, we're hard pressed to come up with anything other than platitudes.

Fortunately, we're resolving that problem. Under the auspices of the Human Development Corps there is about to be inaugurated a computerized system of determining the characteristics of the disadvantaged group that we're trying to represent. It should be ready and in operation shortly.

The characteristics of the clientele that we have to serve and for which we, as job developers, will be asked to go into the field and develop jobs for, can then be explained in meaningful terms.

What I am saying, is job developers are not trained, or equipped to sit down with the employer. I am finding employers wanting to help.

Now if we have inexperienced individuals out in the field attempting to develop jobs, and attempting to advise and counsel an employer, we're not going to succeed, and we're not succeeding. We have attempted to bring into our organization individuals who are, or have been, employers, and who have been in personnel and industrial relations work, so that they can sit down with the employers and really discuss the manner in which the disadvantaged can be assimilated into the company.

The other area is a need for employment technicians, professional counsellors who can go out into the field and counsel these individuals.

Many job developers do not know how to tell an employer about the supportive services available.

T. JACQUES: In Watts we held what we called employer clinics, consisting of ten to fifteen different employers, once a week. At these sessions employers would talk to perhaps the manager and a job developer.

Employers have lots of stereotyped notions about disadvantaged people in general, and minority people in particular.

We heard such things as "I'd like to hire somebody but maybe he'll go to sleep on the job." Or, "He won't work on Monday," or "He won't work on the day after payday," "He'll steal"; "He'd rather be on welfare"; "My other employees will quit," etc.

We found out that these guys were quite serious; they had no contact with the minority community at all. So we found in these sessions that we had to interpret the community for the benefit of the employers. We found them in a better frame of mind once these notions were dispelled, and they helped one another to dispell these notions. When a notion that one employer had appeared ridiculous to another employer, we never really had to say anything, his colleague would simply refute him.

The Watts Experience

R. A. NIXON: How much better is the job situation in Watts today than it was two years ago?

T. JACQUES: Well, its hard to tell statistically, because we have an inmigration from the South, but it's nowhere near what everybody says it is. We do have some inadequate high schools turning out kids into the labor market, not prepared for anything. **But the job situation is not much better.** The over-all atmosphere, the tolerance threshold, you might say, is better. But it's very difficult to get down to actual figures.

There is an improvement in employer attitudes. Employers who had never hired minority groups, are now looking for them.

But the kind of minority-group people they are looking for are not the kind who would ordinarily be classed as disadvantaged. They're looking for people with skills and work histories, even if the work histories aren't the best.

Employers are really recruiting in Negro neighborhoods. Eventually, when they run out of the better qualified people, they may begin to look at some who are not quite so well off.

R. KANE: The Department of Labor and OEO have poured 21 million dollars a year into the Watts area. This has not, apparently, produced 21 million dollars of value.

Moreover, I do not think that it is going to take that kind of money to start out in each of the slum areas of America. I think we can all find a simpler and better solution.

Issues in the Private Sector

MR. COLE: I think that too few cities have made efforts at getting the real top industrial leadership behind hiring the kinds of kids we're talking about. Without people with that kind of influence and industrial muscle behind you, you are not going to sell industry on hiring the disadvantaged. You've got to make it a kind of "in" thing to do.

We seem to be getting back in the old bag of trying to deliver a tailored employee to the employer. And that is not the answer to the kind of problem we're looking at.

We've got to have industry training these kids. We've got to deliver them to industry and let industry train them, because the kids won't hold still for long training programs unconnected with the work site. They're not interested in that. They discount the future a lot more rapidly. They don't want training, they want a job.

Once on the job you can get them to take training if the employer knows how to work with the initial problems and ambiguities of doing business with disadvantaged kids. But the job is much more to train industry, and to help industry train the kid, than it is to train the kid and get him ready for industry.

G. POLANSKY: The employer is getting to the point of being the bad boy. However, he also has a problem. The problem is to put a green person into a work situation. How do you do it? Well, to my knowledge, industry today doesn't know how.

Today we have to find new ways of training these people. I'd like to bring out an example of what we've done at Arrow Tool Company. We're primarily a job shop which employs tool and die makers, precision machinists, etc. Our work is complex, very close tolerance type of work. And the person who does this type of work today has to be adept in both skilled manipulations, plus algebra, geometry, and trigonometry, even to the point of knowing Fortran, a new language of computerization.

Now how do you bring these people from green non-high school graduates to this level? You have to create in industry a self sustaining training apparatus.

So we created a system, and we call it a coach-instructor system, where we take people from all kinds of backgrounds, sixth-grade education, or barely speak English, etc., and train them to enter a job over a 12-week period, using a coach-instructor at a vocational school. After the 12 weeks, the trainees come into a working environment with the coach-instructor. He then has a responsibility to integrate them into the organization and to be productive, to reduce the burden on the foreman, and to create a training atmosphere.

W. FLYNN: A question was asked: why should industry be involved in this whole area? Well, perhaps industry is far more pragmatic than any of you, but maybe those who are government people have a different interest in the situation. You see, we tell our members a very simple thing: if you don't get involved in job development activity, you are going to pay anyway. We tell them you're probably going to pay more if you let it rest with a government kind of program. So perhaps we are a little more direct with our own members, with industry in general, by trying to give them a practical reason why, from an economic program in their community that will cost them far less to execute than many government programs, and be incomparably more in control of the program.

Approximately two years ago, we at N.A.M. tried to develop an in-plant basic education program. We used youths from the streets of Harlem to start that program and to improve the technology whereby people could acquire basic tools in order to get into the skill training programs of the companies.

This program was successful. It was tried on an experimental basis at the Diamond Alkali Company, using as organization known as the Board for Fundamental Education. This organization has signed a contract to deal with 1600 steel workers. The program was started with 20 people some 18 months ago, and has now expanded to quite a few companies in New York State.

We have encouraged this same type of a technique, in Chicago where 41 companies have repeated a basic education program at Campbell Soup that was started quite a few years ago, utilizing the services of the local board of education. This represents a cooperative relationship between a governmental agency and business. The program has grown, and some 1,000 people have been upgraded by the program.

Discrimination in Hiring

S. BERNSTEIN: Dr. Nixon asked a question before as to how much change has really taken place. Now, I think St. Louis probably has today one of the more sophisticated training programs, involving civic groups, the industrial relations club, the political structure, etc. But I would be the first to say to you, and I'd be less than honest if I did not say, that we are about 5 percent along the way, or we are 10 percent along the way. Because I frankly do not believe that this sort of commitment that we are referring to here is fully accepted by the employer. Everybody becomes very excited after a riot occurs. But how much sustaining power do you have after the riot is over, and how much actually happens in the way of commitment?

Now what I am saying is simply this. I'm not so sure, by having all the programs that we have, that they are going to make any appreciable change. Someone alluded to the construction industry before. Oh, we're very proud in St. Louis. We finally got 8 Negro apprentices into the apprenticeship program! This is more, incidentally, than had been accepted in 20 years. But there are literally hundreds, if not thousands, that **should** be going into the apprenticeship training program.

Fred Karches talks about the restructuring of jobs. Now I know that there has been some restructuring of jobs, but again when you go back to the percentage, in terms of the over-all problem, how far have we actually come along this particular route?

We can pontificate, but are we really getting down to the nub of the problem? And that problem, to me, is this present-day economy, given the selection factor, and the factor of discrimination. The real question is, what are we going to do about these?

J. FREITAS: Mr. Bernstein mentioned the factor of racial discrimination, which Dr. Nixon also mentioned. It occurs to me that this is the key to job development. That employers are conveniently forgetting that racial discrimination **caused** the problems that currently exist regarding disadvantaged youth, or black people, or Mexican people, and are conveniently trying to skirt recognition of this issue and the fact that it exists today. It exists more sharply today because of the paradox of our over-all unemployment rate, for example, our over-all affluence alongside our frustration and despair about the inner city.

I would also suggest that major problems in integration of private industry and government are really problems because the people we're talking about are black, or are Spanish-speaking. We should, therefore, study the merit of some of these problems. And I can give two specific examples.

During many sessions on the problem of integration in industry one governmental official privately mentioned the fact that police records were a barrier to the successful integration of minorities into the work force of a major company. But this particular company did a survey of its current employees in one plant and found that 65 percent of them had police records and 25 percent of the 65 percent had felony records. I think that really tells us something. If the police records belong to a black person that makes a difference.

In another example, the Bar Association of San Francisco ran a program for integrating legal stenos. The program included 12 young ladies who had some typing and steno skills to go through a voluntary night course whereby they could increase their skills for law firms. The Urban League then helped place these people.

We placed 8 out of 12. But one who is still to be placed, the best skilled of the group, and the first referred out in each case, was repeatedly rejected by employers while the other girls referred after were accepted.

The apparent reason, we learned, was that she was a little plump, a little darker than the other girls, with features somewhat more Negroid than the others, although she was well groomed, with excellent skills and a good personality.

Mr. Cassell mentioned the fact that there weren't too many minority persons involved in a certain graduate business school. I think an even better indication that institutions are skirting the issue of racial discrimination is by looking at the graduate business school curriculum. There's nothing in the curriculum except maybe a problem or a special seminar that let the young men who are going into business become aware of the facets of the problem.

And I think that we have to study the history of this problem of racial discrimination until we come to a realization of it.

R. SCHRANK: In a survey I made, it became very clear to me that the major corporations in New York have, in fact, done little about the minority group problems, apart from some token employment in front offices and other visible places.

Having worked with some of the corporations in the city on this problem, I have become convinced that many can abide just a very small number of black people working in them. I have had an interesting experience with the Internal Revenue Service on this, about two months ago.

We approached the Internal Revenue people on using our kids in a program in their data processing section, and they cooperated very enthusiastically since Washington had given the go ahead.

It was agreed we would provide 65 kids to that section. Everything went fine until our 65 kids showed up. I needn't tell you that the 65 kids were all Negro and Puerto Rican, because the Neighborhood Youth Corps in New York City is essentially a 90 percent Puerto Rican and Negro operation.

Well, we were supposed to have a press conference in which the Mayor and other people had been slated to participate and announce this program. But the press conference was very suddenly called off. I wasn't sure why, but in talking with the Internal Revenue people, I sensed a panic in the whole group. The panic was over 50 or 60 black kids all showing up at once in one place!

And as far as the Internal Revenue people were concerned, there was riot and mayhem written all over such a situation.

Nevertheless, we, of course, insisted that the deal be kept, and they did. About two months later, the director called me to tell me that the program was working out magnificently.

Now, in a sense, I think that incident says a lot about the problem we're working with — they are hiring trouble.

This fix of mind, of course, comes from the whole setting in which we live. I don't want to ascribe this entirely to employers; unions and their members have this fix of mind and they're not employers. I think many of us here would accept the notion that disadvantaged people have been, in a sense, **negotiated out** of this society. And what we are talking about essentially is how do we negotiate them back in again.

II. JOB DEVELOPMENT AND THE CIVIL SERVICE

Chairman: Dean Alex Rosen

The purposes of this session tonight on Civil Service are as follows: To focus on government jobs and related entry jobs, hiring standards, and related entry job hiring standards as an aspect of job development for the disadvantaged.

And secondly, how to have government match its own requests of private employers in this regard. How does the government match practice with policy? We want to bring practice and philosophy together at this session.

Remarks of Mr. Sam Leff:

"Federal Civil Service and Job Development"

I'd like to describe to you, on a rather practical plane, just what the federal government is doing in the area of job development. The federal service, has undertaken a number of steps which provide assistance to the "disadvantaged" who are interested in federal jobs.

Identification of Job Openings

The Commission is a tiny agency relative to the over 2,800,000 employees which now make up the federal service. This covers 2,600,000 jobs in the continental United States, and we'll use the latter figure as a basis for our estimates. Both by law, and by necessity, agencies are responsible for running their own programs; they make the day to day decisions regarding personnel. The agencies hire people, not the Civil Service Commission. We're the central personnel agency for the federal service.

The individual agencies determine the assignments and create jobs. We don't have that authority. The agencies are responsible for running the programs which Congress has authorized them. This doesn't mean we don't have a role. We have a very important one, because as the central personnel agency, we do determine the policy and standards for various positions including standards that govern pay and those determining the basis for entry into the service and promotion.

There are a number of programs and functions involved here. Recruitment examination, development of qualification requirements, training, job redesign, the question of part-time employment, full-time employment for students, etc. I will try to give you a picture of what is taking place in the Federal service.

With 2.6 million jobs, you might say: "Boy! that's the answer. What a mass of jobs for the people we're trying to place." You must remember that these jobs literally cover the gamut of human endeavor — from the blue collar jobs to bureau directors. And they're not all in the major cities. Ten percent of the jobs are in Washington, D. C.; 90 percent literally spread throughout the length and breadth of the country, not counting those outside of the United States.

The Post Office Department alone has over 35,000 offices. On the other hand, with 2.6 million jobs in the continental United States, we can't close our eyes to the fact that there **is** room for tremendous employment opportunities to disadvantaged young people. However, when you try to identify them you do run into problems.

Just to give you an idea of the size of the problem that we face: with 2.6 million jobs as a beginning, you immediately recognize that the bulk of them are above the entry level. For example, we have about 1.2 million (the figure here is out of date already) that are what we call the "white-collar jobs." Of these, 60,000 are what we would classify as the really low entry-level jobs that would not require prior experience or any kind of specialized training, or high school education. Incidentally, none of our jobs specify high school education.

There are now over 700,000 of the blue-collar jobs, in trades and crafts. Of these, fewer than 200,000 would be considered entry level jobs demanding minimum specialized training.

In the postal field service, of more than 600,000 total jobs in the Post Office, there are fewer than 60,000 in the lowest entry level. There are 380,000 postal clerk and carrier jobs which do not require any kind of prior education or experience. But many of them do involve challenging tasks.

So we end up with quite a few jobs, most of them already filled. Not all of them represent realistic job opportunities because of location.

No matter how we look at it, the number of vacancies that occur is not really the total figure, which should include what is possible to create through job development and job restructuring.

The "MUST" Program

A word about the MUST Program. Now MUST is an acronym for Maximum Utilization of Skills and Training. There are three manpower goals to the MUST program. First is the better use of all skills and talents available in the labor market; second, improved efficiency and economy in the federal service; and third, better use of the skills of present employees. The concept was that no potential should be untapped and no talent wasted. This made sense in terms of economy, utilization of personnel, and opportunities for disadvantaged people to enter the federal service.

Perhaps the roughest job of all in my area is getting managers and supervisors to reconsider the way they operate with a view to creating additional jobs.

Now is the opportune time, because they're having trouble filling their jobs. Not many managers would rather sit with loads of vacancies, jobs unfilled, and scream that they need professional people, and trained technicians.

Although they can't get trained technicians, many still sit with those jobs for months sometimes. So MUST comes in and asks them to redesign their jobs; shred out the professional duties to create technician jobs; then shred out the more difficult tasks of the technician jobs and create aide jobs. Then they would have "bodies" to perform the jobs rather than sit there with unfilled vacancies.

This is the concept of MUST in a nutshell. The program was launched in April '66, and it called for a planned, all-out effort on the part of agencies to apply sound job redesign principles. There was a lot of hope at the beginning, and tremendous response from the agency heads. They were sincere, and wanted to cooperate in filling vacancies, by creating jobs that would call for people with lesser skills, while at the same time providing additional opportunities for people who, for lack of specialized training, have not been able to enter the service.

We got reports as of March 1, 1967, from all over the country showing substantial progress, especially in the area of redesigning jobs at the entry level.

In fact, progress at that level has been much better than at the professional and technician levels. We had hoped that that would take place too, because it would impart a trickling-down effect. If you can assign some of the more routine duties of nurses to nursing assistants and aides, you do create opportunities at the bottom as well. But we've primarily been successful at the entry levels.

The Hiring Process

Along with this there have been improvements in the hiring process. We have been reexamining our qualification requirements, tests and other personnel measurement methods. We're in the process of reviewing every question in every one of our tests. We want to see if we can detect those things that are culturally unfair on the surface, or that are not related to actual job requirements.

We've also been looking for alternate evidence of ability. We have a program in the blue-collar area called the Job Elements Examining Program, where tests are not used as a basis for entrance or promotion. In some cases tests are used, but only as alternative evidence of a skill. And the emphasis there is on skill per se, without regard as to how the skill was acquired, whether it's through the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, or whatever. Anyway one can demonstrate a skill — we'll take that as evidence as much as we'll take completion of an education course, or vactional school, high school course, or prior experience.

Now there are several principles that necessarily guide us in reevaluating our standards and tests. One, we have to have people who can move in and do the jobs that are required of them, and the judges of that are the people who are responsible for the program. The requirements must be reasonable, they must be relevant to the work to be done, and maximum opportunity must be presented to every citizen to compete equally for federal employment. That's law.

We just can't say: here's a test that's open, but only the people at that table can apply. If we set the requirements, we have to publicize them so everyone can compete and be measured against the same standards. But this doesn't mean that we can't give credit for all kinds of experience and training, nor does it mean that a person with a high school education is any better qualified to do elementary cleaning work than a person without a high school education.

Disseminating Information

I should also note briefly our efforts at better information outlets, to have one-stop job information centers in 65 cities, which are now being established, as well as greater involvement with community groups and other training programs.

Our major effort has been to review all of our procedures and to make sure that they are designed to let people in, not to shut them out.

Remarks of Mr. Solomon Hoberman:

"New York City Civil Service and Job Development"

The job of the New York City Department of Personnel is to recruit and maintain a force of some 315,000. It's a matter of recruiting, selecting, and maintaining an effective and efficient work force. The function of government is primarily to perform services for its citizens.

Until about seven years ago, our primary concern was doing the job of government as efficiently and effectively as possible. About that time we became concerned, as an employer, with the problem of job opportunities for the citizens of the community. And we became aware — although many of us were partially aware of this before that — that we were the major employer in the community. We employed more than 10 percent of all the employed people in New York. Consequently, what we did had a tremendous effect upon the entire community, and that whether we employed drop-outs or not would have an effect not only on us, but on all other employers as well. If we required fully-trained journeymen for each position, it would have an effect on the employment in other industries and on whether or not industry remained in New York. For if we raised our salaries, and recruietd every competent stenographer in the city, obviously the major companies who make their headquarters here would soon leave the city and go to other places where they could hire competent stenographers.

Job Development Programs

So we entered then into a number of programs designed to train people in shortage areas. We entered into other programs designed to keep our young men and women in school until they were fully trained. About that time we set up a committee which dealt with manpower utilization in the New York area.

The committee included representatives of most of the ethnic groups in the city, as well as major employers, representatives of the federal, state and city governments. While that committee did not remain in existence too long, some programs resulted from it which indicate our thinking. One of these, and probably the most successful of them, was the Cooperative Education Program.

The New York Board of Education has had almost 50 years of Cooperative Education Programs, in which young men and women during their senior year in high school work in the major industrial firms, banks, insurance companies, etc., as clerks, stenographers, and bookkeepers. This was an elite program. The top ranking students in the class got these jobs and the employers were able to employ them for a year on a part-time basis to determine whether or not they wished to retain them as permanent employees.

We then sought to test whether that program could be adopted to train young men and women who are "marginal," or potential drop-outs, or who, even if they were graduated from high school, would not have employment opportunities. In this we were successful in interesting the Ford Foundation, who provided the funds for the administrative overhead for the program's first four years.

We started off with some 200 employees. These were high school students who were certified by the high schools as "marginal" students, for whom we provided regular city jobs. We did not say to the agencies of the city: "here are extra funds, employ these people." We had the feeling that if we did that, they would continue to employ them even if they were unsatisfactory employees.

Instead we said to them: we will take your regularly budgeted lines for clerks, stenographers, and typists, etc., and you will pay these young people almost the same as you would pay a regular employee. Also we expected them to try to get the same performance from them that they would expect from regular employees, and we gave them assistance in this regard.

The program was pretty tough to get started. Fortunately, the Department of Personnel was in a position to apply pressure. Those of you who are government employees and have had dealings with a central personnel agency know that sometime or other, each agency of government appeals to the personnel department, or the United States Civil Service Commission for something. And our pay-off in this case was jobs for these young people.

At the present time we have some 1400 of these young people employed in this program, we place better than 10 percent of them each year in government jobs, about 30 percent more in private jobs, 10 percent more go on to higher education, and the others have written to us from time to time that they, too, have been placed.

We provide them with training on Saturdays. They come in without pay and volunteer to take additional training to qualify them for both government and non-government jobs. And when the kids register for this, better than 90 percent of them see the programs through to the end. We provide job counselling and job seeking in the summer months after graduation. Better than 80 percent of them stick it out until we get jobs for them.

In addition to that program, we've taken on a cooperative venture with the Neighborhood Youth Corps. This is not a matter of simply placing kids in jobs, but attempting to get jobs for them which will provide training leading to other permanent jobs.

On programs of this sort, you've got to make sure you carry through, and this means avoid providing work for trainees in areas where they can't get a job after training.

We're providing jobs for members of relief families. Again the attempt is to provide on-the-job training which will lead to permanent employment.

We're not nearly as successful as we want to be, but nevertheless we feel that this is the need.

The general trend in American civil service for the past hundred years has been to employ journeymen — people who can do the job you assign to them. This generally means that you have an experience requirement that a kid in the slums could neither get nor fake. And that means you've barred him.

Job Development and Skill Shortages

We have to face up to the fact that government has to be more expensive than a profit-making organization. That we have to employ people who can't do the job and train them to do it. And if, after that, private industry takes them from you, you have tosay: "Great! Let's get another man who can't do the job!" And we've set up a couple of programs of this type.

For many years, and at the present time, we've had a shortage in competent engineering help. We employ, right now, third, fourth, and fifth rate engineers. We employ engineers of this caliber because many of the jobs we have to perform aren't worthy of the top-notch graduates of engineering schools.

But even a fourth-rate engineer makes a pretty good clerk. And consequently, a supervisory engineer would rather have that fourth-rate engineer than an incompetent clerk; it's more flexible, he does a better clerical job, and furthermore, there's another important consideration: you really can't have many senior engineers unless you have an appreciable number of assistant engineers somewhere along the line.

I can also tell you that unions will object to the fact that we take out some of the functions from these engineering jobs and turn them over to clerks, because across the collective bargaining table, they really don't have the same power if there's no shortage of engineers. So here you have the entire power structure calling for fourth-rate engineers, and more of them! And there you have a completely powerless structure asking for jobs.

Special Problems

We have other problems. We have the problem not only of unmarried mothers, but also of unmarried fathers. And it turns out that the Civil Service frowns upon both of them! But the New York Civil Service Commission really doesn't care. We don't really care whether a woman is unmarried with three children, or a man is unmarried with five. If they have done something illegal, let the law take care of it. We will give them employment.

We've also taken on the matter of criminal records recently. Along with the United States Civil Service Commission, we no longer ask whether someone's been arrested or not, and in many areas we're saying we have a responsibility to give employment to them, not only if they've been arrested, but also if they've been convicted. And we're fighting that battle now.

DISCUSSION

Problems of Change in Civil Service

S. GANZ: The role of the Civil Service Commission, one of the oldest institutions around the Washington scene, has been a traditional one for a great many years. But under the able leadership of John Macy, so much was done in the last five or six years that you wonder what got the job done. Was there new legislation? Was there some tactical, procedural, or other leverage used? I think the answer is that more was done by influence and leverage than was done by any change in legislation.

I submit that, despite Mr. Leff's presentation here, it's not always the agencies that have the last say. I think there's tremendous quid-pro-quo leverage on the part of the Civil Service Commission, such as holding up papers for promotions, or reorganization, etc., if need be.

Change in Response to Community Need

R. SCHRANK: We talk about the job of civil service as giving service to the community, and we frame what happens in civil service around that. I would first of all question what relevance many of the civil service entrance and promotion exams have to giving the service what is required. I think many people in the Civil Service Commission would agree that there isn't a heck of a lot of relevance to those exams in terms of the job.

As a matter of fact, a lot of administrators say to me they're not even interested in a person's previous experience. They would really prefer to train their own personnel, because in the last analysis, they have to administer the programs. So they do their own kind of in-service training, no matter what happened on an examination.

The second question is, whom is the service directed to in the central city today? The service more and more in the central cities of this country is being directed at the population with especially great problems.

In a sense, there's a big contradiction here: many of the people who are clients to the service are, in fact, barred from participating in it by an ingrown system developed over the years which I think is no longer relevant.

And it's the people living in the communities served that are barred by the system. Now these people have a right to participate. A citizen has a right to participate in a government employment program, whether it be federal, state, county, or city.

A lot of people who work in our civil service systems leave the city at five o'clock. Yet the people who live in the city can't get into the system. Well, there's something wrong with this system. It's not a reciprocal operation, and in my view that's what it ought to be.

Now if the system is not operating in this way, then it ought to be changed.

At least we ought to begin recognizing that there's something wrong with the structure and then begin to figure out how we change it.

And the change that's needed is that a large section of the ghetto population is, in fact, barred from participation in Civil Service for a whole variety of reasons, including arrest records, exams, and all kinds of other things.

S. LEFF: In respect to Mr. Schrank's statement about the structure, I'd like him to compare the structure of about 15 years ago with the one today in the federal service, and say it's the same. I think he might have examined how much flexibility there is in the basic law and how much change there has been in administration, standards and requirements.

S. GANZ: It seems to me that there are elements worth examining in the structure, to the view of re-directing and changing them.

And while there has been a great deal of movement in 15 years, I don't think we have another 15 years left to go at the previous rate.

S. BURT: We are asking the private sector for a job-now-train-later approach. We say to them that they should simply take these people on, and train them. Don't lower your standards, do anything you have to, but get them on your payroll and start working with them. Is there room for this approach in the federal service? Hasn't the federal service in a sense done this in it's summer program? You've issued a directive during the summer months to authorize agencies to take one kid for every hundred employees. Is there room for that kind of an approach on a permanent basis?

S. LEFF: That's a good question. But the question is whether it's public policy to reserve a segment of jobs in the federal service to the disadvantaged. I don't see how we can do that now.

S. BURT: Why should the federal government and it's agencies consider themselves different from private industry employers? Why doesn't the federal government practice what it preaches? Private industry employers are told to hire these people, give them basic education if they need it, train them, establish career ladders, restructure jobs, and do all that is necessary.

And yet we in the federal government won't do it. We answer: public policy doesn't permit us. It seems to me that private industry employers might well bring a court case over this. Why is something good for one segment of the economy that is not good for another segment of the economy?

Private industry has taught us many lessons; the reports have indicated that the people we considered uneducable are educable; people we considered untrainable are trainable; the people whom we thought were nonproductive are very productive. If private industry can do it, and case study after case study, in the newspapers and the reports of the Chamber of Commerce, the NAM reports, the National Industrial Conference Board reports — all testify that they can. But we in government ignore all of this.

Changes in Civil Service Procedures

R. COLE: I'd like to call Mr. Leff's attention to a couple of examples. I may be wrong on the statistics, but my understanding is that an experiment was tried in San Francisco in the Post Office, where 120 people were hired to do basic level jobs. They spent two hours a day learning to pass whatever test required for the job they were already doing. At the end of a year, however, 100 of the 120 were deemed competent by their supervisors, but only 17 managed to pass the test. The second example is one from the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has never been under Civil Service, probably has the highest morale of any government agency, and is one of the truly creative inventions of our government.

Given the Tennessee Valley Authority example, wouldn't it make sense to just forget Civil Service, and go ahead and hire inefficient people if you're going to train them anyway, and hire qualified people where you need them? In short, get off the whole straightjacket of Civil Service, and simply hire people who can do the job.

S. LEFF: Starting with your premise, no one can argue with it. I think TVA is a well-known agency and there are many other government programs that have tremendous records of creativity and achievement. But TVA has a very good merit system, by the way. They have a merit system which is no different from ours. We have an interchange system with them, they accept our criteria, we accept theirs. So when you set one up as an example, and say the other one doesn't fit, it doesn't make sense.

I think there is an assumption here that people aren't being hired. We get reports on a regular basis. People **are** being hired as worker-trainees, and under a title for an examination in New York and in California, we're hiring people at the Grade 2 level. Post offices are hiring people, many of whom are disadvantaged.

Many of our exams do not require a written test. Some of those hired are graduates of the Job Corps or the Neighborhood Youth Corps. I don't know the specific examples your talking about.

R. COLE How far can they move before you require them to take exams? In other words, are we getting a new Civil Service of Negro Pfc.'s?

S. LEFF: If they were to apply for a job as engineer, they'd not have to take a written exam, but they would have to meet the written description for engineering jobs. I don't know where you get your facts, but the jobs I'm speaking of do not require tests for entry and do not require tests for upgrading.

These people come in under a regular Civil Service examination. They have as much status as I have with my 25 years of service.

Now can we get down to a more concrete case. I refer to my colleague, George McQuoid. The examinations that are being given in New York for these levels are jobs that give them career conditional appointments. Is that right?

G. McQUOID: That's right. We have an examination-based system. But these are not always written examinations. They are often based on a person's background of experience and training, and I don't think there's a prospect that we can ever completely depart from this and still survive as a public entity, with a strong tradition for guaranteeing the right of every person to compete for a place on the government payroll.

In early December, with a great deal of cooperation from Mr. Ganz's organization, we announced a Youth Opportunity Trainee examination here in New York City. I think we fall almost automatically into the trap of thinking of examinations in terms of a written test, or one for a guy who is to be Senior Nuclear Physicist, etc.

But the standard used in this instance required no written test and no experience. It was for the basic entry level jobs, these are General Schedule —1, or Wage Board —1, and you can't get any lower than that. But it provided for career appointments to these jobs.

As a testing device we used a questionnaire in which we were openly and obviously shooting for persons who were under 25. We attempted to find out, using one of the points that Sam Leff mentioned earlier, the "job element" approach but kind of wildly adapted to this situation — to find out really what the kid had done in terms of indications of dependability, interest in advancement, assumption of responsibility, leadership, etc.

We had them answer questions which actually became part of a scoring scheme. The questions went not only to the form of experience on jobs he might have had, but also indicators of what he had done at school, what sort of responsibilities he or she had had — even if they were indicators only of baby-sitting or house-cleaning responsibilities.

Out of this we came out with a kind of formal Civil Service register that I think surprised a lot of us in terms of the degree of potential, which you could grasp simply by going through the papers submitted by these youngsters.

From this register we have made about a hundred appointments to federal agencies in New York City. Now that's not enough, but it's an interesting start based exactly on the point concerning the rigidity of standards, etc.

The Tydings Bill and Civil Service Jobs

R. BURT: Notwithstanding the picture, Mr. Leff presents, I, as a non-professional, came across massive frustration.

Now I don't know whether this has been experienced by others here; I know that many people, in particular, the United Planning Organization, in Washington, have time and again tried in dealing with the Civil Service Commission, and in dealing with people in personnel positions in the District of Columbia government, to map out a whole variety of entry level jobs, of ways to get around the testing requirement, of ways to even work within the existing system of examinations. For example, they've gone out to the Lawton Prison for Youth, to administer tests there, following an intensive kind of program.

And again they have found that it's just like pulling teeth, because sometimes, it's impossible to get from the Civil Service clear directives at the top, and move them on down to actual implementation in the field.

Now there are a lot of ways to deal with this problem, and one way, obviously, is to keep pushing from the top. Now your message tonight, I think, is that that push will continue.

But there's another way as well, and it's the way that we have tried to work toward in the legislation that Senator Tydings is introducing, which has, in effect, a two-fold purpose. One is to give a Congressional push to the whole idea, simply by indicating the intent of the Congress.

But second of all, the feeling that I have is that the merit system, enshrined as it has been, doesn't work here and need not work, and in many ways is an encumberance. There are ways to soften its rigors without still running up against the kind of mythical problems that one finds.

But the defenders will say, your going back to the old system of the 19th century, with rampant corruption and jobs being sold on the street! Now the theory of the Tydings legislation is simply this: first, to identify vacancies, recurring vacancies, within the Civl Service, and then to set up, where it is possible, training programs directed specifically to those jobs. Positions such as clerk-typists, photographers, or mimeograph machine operators, or mechanics of different sorts, drivers, or any number of positions where there are vacancies. The next step will then be to pull people into these programs with the clear assurance that when they finish the program, they will have a federal job.

One of the terrible frustrations that has been communicated to us relates to the kids, who when they take the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, or any of the other programs, think they'll end up with jobs. If there's one thing that contributes to the kind of really seething frustration, among a host of young people — is the promise that have been held out to kids by job training programs. These have not been fulfilled.

It is crucial to try and set up a program which would then bridge this gap, i.e., get a guy into a job following a training program.

By focusing the program on vacancies, seems to me is the successful handle that can be used to avoid the charge that we're throwing away the merit system. We're not throwing away the merit system, if we don't have people to fill those jobs.

S. LEFF: We do know the occupations in which there are shortage areas. Now many of these are at the professional levels. Obviously we're short of physicians, of engineers, physical scientists, biological scientists, and many others. By the way, when we announce an examination for many entry levels, we don't get a handful of applications; we get thousands.

The shortage areas that you are speaking of are jobs that **ought** to be done. It's not that there's a shortage area for nursing assistants and clerk-typists. We do have programs that are tied in to training in the schools, training programs that are given by other outside organizations; these trainees often come in unable to pass a test.

When we announce an examination, we just can't say that only those people who pass training courses may get in. Because in some places, in Texas for example, there are hundreds of people who are well qualified and are willing to work at that grade level. So we can't say: No, the job's not for you.

There is a tremendous need for x-ray technicians, all of the medical support services. And the shortage area exist mainly at the higher level of technicians. If we can shred out the simpler duties from this group of occupations in the shortage areas where there just aren't enough people in the total population, then we could provide jobs. And we're doing it now.

But whether you can increase it, extend it, hasten it, by legislation or by a statement of legislative support, I don't know. I know efforts are being made. The Veterans Administration and a number of others are doing this in the case of nursing assistants. Still other agencies are doing it in the case of physical science technicians and biological science techniians.

We literally have thousands of such jobs that we are filling. We are asking for computer technicians; we're asking the CAP organizations to arrange for training programs for those kids who, upon completion of their courses, will be able to qualify for these jobs. And they will have a better chance than most.

S. HOBERMAN: Mr. Burt, the time is past when we can hope to solve these problems by powerful statements and $500,000, which is all your bill provides. That little program I spoke about for cooperative education, which really doesn't do very much and is confined to the City of New York, only cost the City of New York $500,000 in administrative overhead, not to speak of the salaries involved.

R. BURT: Before you dwell excessively on that sum, the way the act is structured, in terms of setting up training programs, a whole panoply of federal statutes designed, obviously, not simply for particular government service, and indeed, not primarily for government service, could be made available. So that all those funds would plug into this act. That $500,000 is meant to do nothing more than staff a small office in the Civil Service Commission to push and prod this program.

S. GANZ: I know that in the Department of Labor, programs that were supposed to be implemented weren't, until the Secretary of Labor laid down the law and said it's got to be done. Then things suddenly started to move very quickly. Not a single change in legislation or anything else was needed.

T. JACQUES: On reading the Tydings bill, I can find nothing in it that says that someone completing the program will in fact be hired. It says: "The individual **shall be eligible** for employment in the job classification . . .

etc.," which implies that the "individual," upon completion of the program, will simply take his place, along with other **eligible individuals.**

The point is, by instituting such a program, aren't we in fact shifting the evils of selection away from the hiring process and onto the training program? Aren't we going to be burdened with the same criteria? Aren't the nice middle-class girls who want to be typists going to be just as eligible, to apply for this program as the disadvantaged girls, and probably beat them out the way they've always beat them out in a test?

Or how do we go about confining the selection to one segment of the community? If we can do that, then maybe we're in business.

R. BURT: Well, you're right. There are two questions you raised. The first is that getting on the eligible list is not the same as getting the job. Now it may be, that they'll run into different kinds of problems of moving from an eligibility list into an actual job. If that's the case then the bill will not do what it is designed to do. And that's something we will really have to consider.

Nonetheless, my understanding was that it would be sufficient to remove a real barrier: to aid kids who complete these courses to get on that eligible list. So if it accomplishes only that, which includes bypassing the examination requirement, the arrest record problem, etc., which keeps them off the eligibility list, things would run better.

Now as for selecting who gets into the program, again you have literally thousands of people you've got to select. Once again where the line is drawn depends on the intent of the program, and the way it's administered. If this program were to get moving, the aim would be to push it into those areas where it is most needed — among the disadvantaged.

Gaps in Training Resources

R. KANE: The assumption, that there is a considerable amount of training available under existing training programs is I think, somewhat of an illusion. There are at present at least two or three times the number of sub-professional, of pre-vocational kinds of programs preparing people for admission to training than there are actual training spots. An actual count, in Los Angeles, for instance, came up with 6,000 training slots to 18,000 pre-vocatioal preparations to fill the 6,000 slots.

The idea that the CAA's, for instance, are going to provide computer technicians would be very well if there were funds available for computer technicians. And I think that the idea that there is a vast resource of training slots, under the Department of Labor, OEO, etc. — all of us will reiterate the fact that they simply do not exist.

R. KANE: I have a specific question for Mr. Leff, a rather important one. About four months ago, Mr. Macy sent a very exciting letter to the heads of all the federal agencies. In it he requested that each of the agencies examine their own structure to determine whether there were sub-professional or restructured entry occupations that could be designed within each of the federal structures to expand the opportunities for entry and sub-professional employment.

At least within the few federal agencies that I know, a variety of ideas and programs were presented. To the best of my knowledge, virtually all of of those proposals are now stuck in the personnel section of each of the federal agencies.

Now I recognize the important forward step taken by the Civil Service Commission in at least proposing this idea, but four months later, with all the proposals stuck in the personnel division, I would like to turn back to Civil Service and ask you: How are we going to follow through on this excellent suggestion of Mr. Macy in getting them through our own personnel sections?

S. LEFF: When we sent that out, we also asked for a report and suggestions. We figured we were going to do more than just exhort. We thought it would be helpful to indicate examples of job redesign that had already been done in the federal service that might trigger additional instances that agencies could think of in terms of their own programs. Now we do have some responses.

The responses indicate to us that agencies are undertaking these programs.

R. KANE: While I recognize the movement on the part of the Civil Service, and the willingness at the appropriate levels in the departments to respond, how are we going to move probably the most rigid sections of our own agencies to respond to opportunities of opening new entry jobs?

S. GANZ: We, who are in the manpower training business, have found the hard way that follow-up evaluations **on-site,** and not through correspondence, is really one of the best ways of implementing a program.

I agree with everything John Macy through his tenure has done, and the thrust has been great. I attended a Federal Executive Board — and a lot of things being done have really surprised me here in New York and elsewhere.

But what I'm suggesting, Mr. Leff, is that you've passed what I would call the stage of policy directive, correspondence, and coordinating committees. Now you have to take the next step, which is forcing the resolution, and you know the best way to do it is evaluation. Is there a **field** evaluation?

S. LEFF: We have a large field inspection program that has worked. The agencies have their own inspection programs. The agency heads have indicated that they're interested in seeing this done.

Impact of Job Development on Civil Service

L. HOUSTON: Sol Hoberman made one assumption, that if you actually hired people from the so-called disadvantaged community, this in turn would mean that you'd have to live with some inefficiency in the operation of government. And I have been waiting for at least some of the participants here to actually challenge that, because it just makes no sense.

Number one, the unemployed are not a homogeneous population. There are gradations of people who are unemployed. But we all know that industry hires people, then trains them. This too might be called inefficiency, until that employee has been trained.

I would like these panelists not to go away with any preconceived notions that all of the people out there who are unemployed actually can't make it.

S. HOBERMAN: My point was not that hiring the unemployed would necessarily mean inefficiency, but rather that if you did obtain inefficiency, that, in a sense, was O.K. too. Because in terms of an entire community, it would mean a more efficient community, even if it meant a less efficient government. And if that is the cost, then it is a desirable thing to do.

S. ROSEN: I really have to challenge this dichotomy between first-class service to citizens and tenth-class employment, because it seems to me that if you reverse the order you have nonsense.

You cannot provide first-class service to citizens without a first-class labor force, and you cannot have a first-class labor force unless you pay them the best salaries and motivate them to the highest extent. It's nonsense to say that you can't elevate stenographers' salaries too high because you drive business out of New York. The contrary is the case.

If you lower wages, as industry after industry has demonstrated in this city, you attract the worst entrepreneurs, the cheapest kinds of businessmen, and you degrade the structure.

I think there is too much talk about providing employment at entry levels and not enough discussion how that employment relates to the structure of the career civil service. Mr. Hoberman talks about fourth-rate engineers. Why do you have them in New York City? Because the city has never given the good ones the motivation to stay. The city doesn't upgrade them, and doesn't give them challenging jobs to do. The city contracts out all the interesting work, and we fight against that.

I have found that there has been virtually no training of employees in the city, except for a narrow spectrum at the very top. And when employees wanted to qualify for promotion through Civil Service examinations, I had to organize a school for them which they could go to on their own time, and pay for out of their own money, in order to become more qualified employees of the city.

Here in New York we have a two-grade Civil Service system, not a one-grade system. We have what is called the classified service and the non-competitive service. And we have lots who will never rise any further. They can never move from the non-competitive to the classified service because they have to pass examinations which have no relationship to the job or qualifications.

We have suggested a very different approach. We want a career civil service, but we want to connect the vital ingredients of promotion, training, and upgrading. And training is the central item in our design.

We believe as a general philosophy that the way to get a career civil service in New York City or anyplace else, is to connect employees with the kind of training programs which are realistic reflections of the requirements they will face as they go up the job ladder, and to make that job ladder available to them on the basis of successful completion of training.

We have the educational resources in this city to do that job; every major city has. We have community colleges and city universities. Every major metropolitan area has exactly the same resources. They ought to be brought into the picture and they ought to be given a challenge of designing, in cooperation with the employing agencies and the line agencies, the kind of training programs that will provide them with employees qualified to take the next step. And when you fill those steps, you may make three or four times as many steps as you now have. You provide people with the maximum possible flexibility and movement from department to department and from skill to skill, because the skills are not that compartmentalized at most levels of city employment. I'm not talking now about Senior Physicists, but about people who do the run-of-the-mill work, the administrative work, and the technical work that goes on in agency after agency.

Summary

S. GANZ: Let me make a couple of general observations as to what I get out of this. I think with respect to job development in the federal service policy has moved forward very extensively. I think the direction has been charted, perhaps not as extensively as we would like. But I think what we really have to address ourselves to is more large-scale implementation, and I suggest that the federal Civil Service structure has a great many reserves which are still relatively untapped.

An important issue has also been raised with respect to hiring. What is the process, and what are the responsibilities of the federal Civil Service relative to the private sector of the economy? What we require of the private sector, should it not also be demanded of federal establishments? And basically aren't there avenues that can be used to make exceptions without wrecking the Civil Service system, that could make the system work more effectively?

The development of jobs and the development of people must relate to each other, because there is a third side, as important as the first two in an active manpower policy. And that is the meshing process of balancing demand with supply. You have to know both sides before you can do that.

The managers of federal programs, like first-line supervisors in private industry, are the key in the federal service, in any civil service, and extensive work must be done with them.

I think there's just as much need for training them to be receptive to the individuals we're trying to place as it is for training and orienting the individuals themselves. This should be a very extensive program and should be followed up with rigorous and continuous evaluation, because no program works well without that. And this does not mean by reports or statistics, but by on-site visits made by the Civil Service establishment.

III. COMMUNITY EXPERIENCE IN JOB DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Remarks of Mr. Curtis Gatlin

"Job Development in St. Louis"

We have established in St. Louis a group for the purpose of cultivating job openings within business and industry.

This entity is Work Opportunities Unlimited. It is a non-profit corporation, funded by the anti-poverty agency and indirectly by OJT funds from the Department of Labor.

The Program

Work Opportunities Unlimited has the mission of job development in the local poverty campaign, and it has not succeeded.

They have managed to plant a sizeable foot in the door of industry, and of the corporate community. But I think we can agree that though the foot is in the door, the door is not yet open.

WOU has been able to assemble a staff with positive goals, but I believe that this staff suffers from some of the same problems of other staffs with similar job development objectives.

Take our staff in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. We have a few job developers attached to NYC, and so far, I can't see any appreciable difference in the approach of our Neighborhood Youth Corps staff and the staff of WOU with respect to Job Development.

The philosophies are different, at least the long range goal is different, but the net results, so far as I can see, is that we have succeeded in making only a very minor gain for our clients with the corporate community. Some employers have made concessions in hiring requirements; they've tended to lower them to reduce some of the artificialities of the screening-out process.

A larger number of employers in St. Louis today will interview a client who has a police record than would have before WOU came into being. A larger number of employers are willing to waive the high school diploma requirement as a result of WOU's efforts. But in relative terms, in comparison with the target population of unemployed and disadvantaged, it's still a relatively slight gain so far, but we've just begun. This mechanism was established by business and industry and set up as an outgrowth of an industrial relations club of personnel and training directors, and staffed and partially funded by them. They are attempting to break new ground in the area of job dilution and job restructuring. Unless the developer gets closer to the people who know the client, in order to be better able to sell the client to the employer, we won't get jobs for those men and women we're serving, and this, I think, is one of the real difficulties for the job development staff.

What I am saying is that there is a gap, a language barrier, a communication barrier between the development field staff and the line staff who are dealing day by day with the clients.

It may well be that we need to work our field staff and our line staff in tandem, form two-man teams, instead of tackling the problem wholesale with job developers trying to develop jobs for a few hundred individuals they can know nothing about.

Major Gaps

To quickly summarize what I see as the major gaps. It seems to me we have a very serious gap in adequate staff, both in numbers and in skills, to effectively counsel and service the disadvantaged population. Two, we lack substantially adequate remediation resources for upgrading them, both educationally and skill-wise. Three, we haven't found many techniques that work in overcoming the massive inner resistance of many clients to accept anything less than direct placement in a real job. This implies that we need satisfactory jobs, even if they are totally subsidized, a very prolonged work program, such as the Nelson Program, in which clients can be doing honest to goodness work. From this perhaps we can then move clients into skilled training. I think we need much closer articulation between the business community on the one hand, and the clients and perhaps the professionals.

Remarks of Mr. William F. X. Flynn

"Industry's Approach to Job Development"

The STEP program (Solutions to Employment Problems) was started by the NAM about 1964. It was one of the first tangible NAM programs which reflected the New Look in the association itself.

We in the NAM, which represents about 75% of the productive capacity of this country, came to realize that the organization was sometimes not responsive to what members thought to be the needs of the time. So in late 1962 we had a change in our operation which culminated in STEP.

It was started to give to our members a tool that we thought would help them in trying to solve some of the difficult personnel problems that they are faced with on a day-to-day basis.

The STEP Program

When started, the program dealt with a wide variety of areas that concerns industry, not only in terms of training or retraining of people, but in terms of relocating them or channeling them into different job situations.

We were also trying to find out not only what was going on in terms of industry activity in these areas, but what in fact were community organizations doing with respect to helping solve problems in relation to the employment process. In 1963-64, therefore, we started to research our member companies and organizations around the country as to what activities or programs they thought were unique in solving some of the problems with which they were confronted. We felt that if we could publish this material and distribute it to our members, that we in fact would be providing them with the tools and services that they needed to be more effective in the management of their businesses.

We received a couple of thousand replies. We culled this down to about 200 examples of what we thought were novel approaches, and started to publish them in case studies.

We then proceeded to distribute these cases to our member companies and interested organizations.

We realized that this was not enough. We had to figure out ways to market these ideas effectively. We had to use what we thought was the expertise of industry to get these ideas out more effectively. And so last year, we proceeded to conduct workshops around the country.

We went into communities, met with business leaders, and asked them to describe the problems that they needed help with. Where we knew of people who had been working in these areas, and our case studies revealed them, we would invite them to these workshops. We'd bring together the problem solvers along with the industrial community so that, in a very direct sense, they could find ways of solving some of their problems.

Most of the workshops that we ran last year covered subjects such as in-plant basic education, skill elevation, and aspects of job matching. Others dealt with how communities might effectively participate in the development of a program like the Philadelphia OIC.

At the same time as we were trying to project to the industrial community things that it could do to cope with the very problems you discussed today, we were also in our own way, within a few years, involved in efforts of creative research.

Other New Programs

As an outgrowth of the STEP program, we developed an activity called MIND, Methods of Intellectual Development, where we tried to develop the kind of technology that would enable industry to incorporate into their training activities a program of basic education that was realy adaptable to their employee population, and on that basis, enable business to move people into skilled training opportunities. In this way we sought to open up job opportunities at the lower level.

We have been working, as others have in St. Louis, in efforts to develop a computerized job matching system.

We are developing a project in the city of Indianapolis where we secured a foundation grant. We interviewed 150 people who were considered to be among the usually unemployed population. This represented a demographic sample of the community's total unemployed population.

We only asked a few questions in the process of trying to classify the respondents. We were only concerned with their work experience, their educational attainment, and what they did in their leisure time.

We then proceeded to examine fifty entry level jobs in an effort to determine what, if anything, was required to perform these jobs. Out of this, we hope to come up with a set of indicators that will enable us to have a clearer definition of what characterizes a typically unemployed population on the supply side, and what, on the demand side, really characterizes entry level jobs. We are putting this into a testing situation in a few areas of the country, and if it works, we intend to make this information available to all of American industry.

What is really required is to give some help to the individual who must work on a day to day relationship with minority groups, with the problems of ethnic relationships, in a work force.

We are now working with an educational institution, and some other experts in the field, in trying to come up with an eight-part program that could be used on educational television, aimed directly at supervisory help to give them the kind of insights they need to deal with their day-to-day working problems in this area. In short, to do more than just simply have equal opportunity pledges signed at the top. You here today are no different from us at NAM. We want to see the problems of the disadvantaged group solved.

When some of you try to communicate with an employer, he perhaps rightly or wrongly looks askance at someone with a social work background.

He makes an assumption, which I guess we all make in our various settings, that he will not be understood. Conversely, I'm sure many of you say that he doesn't really understand you and **your** problems. For this reason, we have been trying to work with a number of agencies, social and governmental, particularly at state and local levels, to make our materials available, so that these bodies could take these studies and gain greater receptivity with employers. By using our materials it gives them an opening wedge with employers.

We're looking into other areas now in search of ways to market our ideas effectively.

We have recently published a kit called "Employment — A Step Towards Crime Prevention." This was an outgrowth of our participation each year in the high school debate program around the country.

For example, I have noted the program in Danbury, Connecticut, where the industrial community worked with the prison institution and its job developer to provide work programs for prisoners six to eight months prior to their release, so that they were ready to step into a world of work rather than into a void, which so often happens and which also keeps the recidivism rate up around 35-40%.

By contrast, in three years of operating this special employment program, the return rate has been something less than 5% of those individuals involved.

We intend to go to the prison system and try and encourage the dissemination of this material to chambers of commerce and business institutions in cities with federal correctional institutions.

We think we will be able to get industry to take more aggressive action in looking at their job requirements through such programs as the job matching computerized system, and through provision of basic education and skill elevation programs for their present employees. We are not ourselves nvolved with any federal funds as an organization, but we will be working as a consultant to a program supported by OEO in the state of North Carolina, utilizing some of the techniques that we have applied both within the NAM or through foundation grants, where we have worked with a variety of business and other organizations in trying to develop programs that would try to solve problems.

This is a very cursory thumbnail sketch of our program.

There are people who want to be effectively employed. Industry, we believe, has the capacity to do all sorts of novel things to employ people effectively.

Remarks of Mr. Fred W. Bezanson

"The Chicago Job Development Experience"

At the present time, I'm connected with somewhere between 15 or 18 experimental or demonstration projects, all of which have job development as an integral part of them.

New Approaches

One is what we call the high support program in business and industry. This is an approach in which we do not place kids unless we get certain kinds of commitments and support from business and industry.

We have some statistics that indicate if there is "high support," both from us and from the company, including communication from top to bottom, working with foremen and supervisors, etc., that the kids will make it and stay on the job. But the results represent only about four or five months, it may still be too early to say we're sure.

The kids that we have placed that do not have, "high support" situations are found to be out of their jobs in a very few weeks. They don't hold them because the climate is not congenial to their staying.

Another thing we're doing is using the board of trustees of a major organization headed by the Who's Who in industry in Chicago. This board of trustees is our influence group.

We are asking them to influence other industry to go into "high support" programs with us.

We are using people from business and industry, and they are gaining entrees that we could not get as social workers or job developers. They open the doors and we follow up with technical assistance and knowledge and information on the clients.

We're using a number of experimental approaches to reach business and industry. We've got a short-term summer program going. Montgomery Ward just provided us with six full time staff members for three months because they're interested in what we're doing.

The J. Walter Thompson Company turned over its crew of 18 people on a part-time basis to work in four community neighborhoods.

They're learning an awful lot about their market, but at the same time, they're bringing the kinds of communication skills that we lack.

Perhaps one of the things we have tried to avoid is looking at job development as if it were in a vacuum.

Everything that we have seen tells us that the universe we're dealing with is much broader. It is pretty difficult to take job development out and look at it as in a laboratory and say: "Here are some elements and here are some gaps."

Job development is part of a comprehensive kind of an experience. We use the term comprehensive manpower. I'm not sure we know what it is. My definition of it is that comprehensive manpower involves any activity that moves a person who is unemployable into full time, permanent employment, with an opportunity for advancement.

Our problem is no longer that of getting our job development staff to know the client. Our problem is getting our job development staff, and the rest of our staff, to know the employers and their problems.

We're now involved in a process of spending three or four months doing our homework before we go into an influential company.

We've decided to select the most influential companies in Chicago; and we're going to concentrate on about 150 of them. By influential, we're not sure yet what criteria we'll use. Size will not always be the determining factor, but if we're going to achieve massive placement of people in jobs, with meaningful chances for moving up, we're going to need business and industry's cooperation.

Staff Education

One of our staff problems which we have recognized recently is that we've become so ingrown that we don't know perhaps what's going on across the country.

We are now undertaking a program to get staff people out to see what others are doing.

Utilization of Community Resources

The other thing is we've got to begin to utilize all of our resources in a community, and we've got to look realistically at what is required in terms of power.

There are a number of ways to do this. Threat is very viable at times, such as the threat to picket. It works, but I'm also enamoured with the idea of moving quietly behind the scenes to put pressure on people, using the power structure of a city to get things going in job development.

We believe at this point that, ultimately, training has to be done by industry, and we're going to have to help them to do it. We are at the present time developing about ten kinds of different experiments to test out ways of getting the interest of industry in training.

One of the things we're involved in now are related problems of housing for clients we place. We're slowly beginning to work with real estate operators.

Thus if we have a client that needs adequate housing, then we're going to have to get adequate housing for him.

We may not be able to get adequate housing for a thousand, but on an individual basis, I think we can help. We'll start with people now in good jobs, but need adequate housing.

We've got to affect the educational system, because everybody says that system isn't doing it's job. But just standing back and knocking them won't help. So we've begun to focus on **why** they can't do their jobs.

Educators are realistic. They know that if they're going to succeed their students have to succeed, so they want as much help as they can get. They want to change the school codes and they want greater freedom in experimental programs. This is why we're moving now in the direction of legislation.

We're beginning to look at possible mergers of programs. We've effected a few, and we're beginning to look at more cooperative kinds of approaches.

I think we've got to say some things to unions. We've got to have some guts about it. We've got a problem with them in Chicago, but we, along with industry, the educational system, and the political structure, are beginning to say it.

If we effect a change in the Building Trades Council in Chicago, which we've got to do, I want it to be their change, because then they're going to be with us all the way.

Remarks of Mr. Robert Schrank

"Job Development As A Social Problem"

We need to define the problem if you're going to talk about any kind of solution. The thing that we've been torn between in this discussion so far is whether we are dealing with a social problem or whether we're dealing with problems of individual failure with the system.

I suggest that how you answer that question will have great influence on what you do in your program. For example, if you diagnosed the problem of unemployment in its urban setting, in the big cities of our country, as individual failure, then I would suggest that all we need do is maybe a little more of what we are doing or maybe do it a little more intensively, such as training, retraining and education, grooming and work attitudes, vestibule training and pre-vestibule training, and all the business we've been preoccupied with for the past few years.

On the other hand, if you see this problem as a social problem which is the way I see it, then you will have to add — and I'm not suggesting that we abandon all those programatic devices in an individual diagnosis — and bring to bear a different set of tools in order to seek out solutions.

Perhaps that's what we are really push-pulling about in the discussion. There is always a tendency to go to the individual's side, because it seems more manageable, in a sense.

We could go on and on about success stories of forty kids we got jobs for here, a hundred we got jobs for there, all the very successful programs we've run, etc.

It convinces me that we're not really dealing with individual problems, and I think everybody in this room could give huge examples of the so-called hard core unemployed making it into employment, given the proper set of conditions.

What does the proper set of conditions boil down to? The proper set of conditions boils down to an eradication or an elimination in an environment of all the factors that barred these people from being employed previously. That's the proper set of conditions.

Also, if you look at the data, you come to a kind of a prima facie conclusion. The data indicates that our critical employment problems are in the ghetto sections of the big cities where unemployment reaches some 33% or 45%.

There was an article in the New York Times this morning on the Bronx situation. The patrolman in charge of that was described as saying: "The main problem here is jobs," said Patrolman Steel, "That's what we need here to have peace and tranquility."

Now maybe that's the social problem that we must deal with more and more for "peace and tranquility" in the big cities. As the warm weather approaches and as the problems of tight density-living in the ghetto communities becomes acute, we begin to see that the focus of the people who are in these communities, and who are working there, is jobs. Again, this is an indication of the diagnosis needed. We are dealing with a social problem here; how could you otherwise analyze a 33% unemployment rate in a section of Bedford-Stuyvesant in New York among youth between the ages of 16 and 19, but going into an all-white section of New York City, finding that same population with an unemployment rate of only 3 or 4%?

The Focus of the Problem

What's the factor operating here? You can begin looking at the differentials, and the most obvious one clearly is that the people who live in the ghettos of New York City are minority groups, basically Negro and Puerto Rican.

Obviously that factor, and how much weight you assign to it, influences what you do about it.

I think industry's responsibility goes far beyond the kind of position which says that they have to make a profit, and they're not social organizations, and they're not concerned with that kind of problem, etc. This is not necessarily true. Industry receives a tremendous amount of support from the Government for all kinds of purposes, which goes beyond just their functioning as a routine corporation, namely: support it in a whole variety of ways so that it remains stable and makes money.

What I am suggesting is that this social problem has to be shared by industry because it is very much a part of our urban setting, and just running away from the cities will not solve these problems.

Dr. Nixon referred to the World War II experience. I was working as a tool and die maker in those days, and I was very actively participating in training people to work in tool rooms because there was a terrible shortage of tool and die makers. We took women out of the homes and put them in tool rooms and had them working on machines within two or three weeks. This was no magic achievement, and I suggest that industry could do this now if it wanted to.

There has to be a will to want to do it. I don't think that the will will come about by our getting to understand one another, as my friend from NAM suggests. And the reason I don't think it will is because I spent a lot of years in the labor movement where I learned some things about reaching "understanding" with employers.

We reached "understanding" with the employers only when we had the place organized. Then we got to understand each other quite well. We made great efforts prior to doing that, to "understand" each other and we never did.

Methods for Change

You can't always choose the nicest way to develop force and pressures to effect social change. They sometimes develop in ways that are not according to the rules of Marquis of Queensbury. This is going to be the nature of this struggle too.

I think we have a role to play in this situation, because I think there is going to be a lot of force placed on this issue of jobs, and I think our role can be to help direct it to areas of job potential in which people in the ghetto communities can fill quite easily.

In that sense, the demonstration projects that are always talked about are useful because they show what can be done in whole variety of areas

What many of them demonstrate in fact is that disadvantaged people can be absorbed into industry and business all across the board, and the excuse given that they're not ready or not prepared is false. I'm reminded that some of the things I have written up that go under the name of "training" and "pre-vestibule," are pretty silly. I have done them mainly to please employers because I told them that we had big grooming programs.

I have found this to be true over and over again. I find it true now in running a Neighborhood Youth Corps operation in this city with over 10,000 kids. I find that when we say to these kids, "This is the way you have to dress to work in Internal Revenue," they in fact show up looking that way the next morning.

Another amazing thing is how quickly they can adapt to what is going on in a work setting.

This is also true in plant situations. I witnessed this in World War II when we brought illiterates into the plant, and how quickly they found out what plant life was about. But the main problem has been that these people have since been barred from these situations.

They fear going there because what they fear is rejection. They don't really believe they're going to be let in. That is part of the frustration in these communities, which causes people to begin tearing up the street out of sheer frustration of not being permitted in.

I suggest that what we will have to do is to think much more about how in fact do we apply pressure. I don't think it can be private or behind the scenes.

I think it has to be very public, because the people in the ghetto community must know that we are doing it. They must know that there are people in government who are aware of this problem, are working on it sincerely, and are using all the weight they can muster within government and within the community.

I also suggest the same thing will have to happen with many of the labor unions, and I think here you have to be discriminating.

I don't think we can take an across the board approach, but I do think there will have to be some confrontations. I went through a few confrontations.

We are doing a building renovation project on the Lower East Side. A lot of the work that goes on in the Neighborhood Youth Corps ought to be stopped and instead, directed toward renovating slum buildings. The reason this isn't done is attributable to a lot of union regulations.

Well, we just went about the job of renovating. The unions came, and I said to the business agents, "I'll tell you what to do. You picket us, okay"? Well, I don't have to tell you, we never got picketed.

On another occasion, a truck came to deliver iron works for a bleacher that we built on the East River Drive Park, a very beautiful bleacher which stands there now as a monument to what our kids can do. The business agent from the Iron Workers Union was on the truck, and he wasn't going to let the iron works be unloaded. They called me and asked: "What should we do"? I said: "Let the kids take the steel off the truck, and let's see who will stop them."

Well, the kids took the steel off the truck and nobody stopped them, and there was no more issue made out of it. But now I have since heard that this practice has been stopped, because somebody in the unions went and complained to some federal department.

That's terrible, because you just can't quit so easily on such issues.

A similar problem is going to arise with the construction of the State office building on 125th Street in Harlem. I suspect in that situation, as in Kennedy-Javits and many other programs, if they think that they're going to go into the ghetto and rebuild the community while unemployed Negroes are standing around watching the white workers rebuild those buildings, what we're reading in the Times these days will be a June picnic compared to what's likely to happen in those communities.

So what I'm saying is that we have to change our focus toward a broader social perspective of the problem while we continue our program.

Of course disadvantaged people can be trained for skills. That's no great revelation. Whom we have to convince of that are employers like Bloomingdales. I placed 35 kids there four years ago in a whole variety of departments, and they did well. Most of them are still there and the store management has said: "These kids are fantastic, they're really wonderful."

My problem was not primarily with the kids, but with the store. Now stores are susceptible because picket lines are very effective there.

Maybe we have to find ways to make other businesses susceptible to change and to help them make the change.

I think that pressure and force from the community are essential to the health of the business community to help it see what is necessary in the big cities. Otherwise, the cities are just going to become places of rioting. I don't think that business or industry wants that. Thus we're dealing with a social problem, that of jobs in the big city. We must see it that way, and begin to present it to business that way. We can't let them escape across the Hudson River every night at five o'clock to disappear into the suburbs, while the rest of us are left here to deal with the social problems.

We are doing a variety of things in the city to reorganize manpower under the Human Resources Administration. We are building neighborhood manpower centers in which a whole variety of services, including the Employment Service, Job Corps and Youth Corps recruiting, and OIC-type skill training centers will be housed.

But while most of us will agree this is a good start, I suggest that it will fail if those centers are in fact unable to produce real jobs for the people who come through the door. Then the whole thing will become an elegant charade in how to coordinate.

Other Approaches

I think that one of the things that we have trouble with is the whole concept of how pressure groups function within our society.

We get very nervous about it. Yet the whole society is really built on it. Just take a look at Medicaid and Medicare, and the opposing pressures by the AMA. Or look at the bar associations, and what the building trades are doing. I'm not making any great moral judgments about this. I'm only suggesting that the ghetto groups do the same thing that other groups do, which is create pressure to maintain their interests. And we have literally hundreds of groups in the country that do that.

They maintain their own position by asserting their interest. So when I suggest that we create pressures on business and industry, I am aware that there will be problems. But these will be problems at a higher level.

Possibly there will also be problems of people being displaced. I, however, am confident that if some suburbanites and nice middle-class people are displaced, they will know how to organize their **own** pressure groups to take care of **their** interests.

Of course, it's a push-pull operation. That's what we're doing all the time. It arises every time there is a problem of an appropriation for some program or other. Those of you in Washington sit in the middle of the biggest push-pull operation in the world.

What I'm suggesting is that job development has to begin to deal with the social problem, the real crisis that exists in these ghetto communities around employment.

DISCUSSION

Job Development Approaches

H. MONTROSS: I've been trying to figure out what are the basic ground rules that the average job developer might follow in order to be successful in that endeavor.

I don't believe that emotionalism is the answer. I don't think that appeals to the employer's sympathy is the answer. I'd like to suggest that the average job developer needs a great deal of training in terms of how to communicate with the employer.

Now I recognize Mr. Bezanson's point about influence, and opening doors, and all that. But when that is cast aside, the results, good or bad, failure or success, are going to be laid to the door of the average job developer whether he's in the employment service, or whether he's in JOBS NOW, or whatever organization he may represent.

I'd like to suggest two approaches. First, I think the job developer, when he goes out, has got to be reasonably sure of what he's selling, that he has to be sure of the applicant's potential to become a fully productive worker.

I think we have to recognize that, regardless of the institutional training program that he comes out of, he's not a fully productive worker, and he shouldn't be sold on that basis, but that he has the potential if the employer would recognize this and take him on to **become** a fully productive worker.

To relate this potential to the employer's needs, you have to have an intimate knowledge of what the employer's needs are and what adjustments can be made in the occupational structure that the employer established to match this potential to the employer's need.

My second point is his approach to the employer. I said it shouldn't be emotional or based on sympathy. I think he has to learn to talk to the employer in terms the employer understands. The employer is a businessman. He understands the language of return on investment.

I think we have to learn to talk to the employer that way and persuade the employer to invest in this potential, to tell him what he'll get as a result of this investment if he takes a chance on this person. I do think that if the proper approach is followed, and this is neither easy nor glamorous, but down-to-earth job development work, we can persuade the employer to share this burden of translating our employability into actual jobs, decent jobs.

V. FLANAGAN: We had a new industry come into Charleston in 1960 or 1961. We had absolutely nobody trained in the area for the kind of jobs that they wanted done.

In order to get workers at all, training programs had to be set up. All of the "cream" in the valley was working, so we had to take a lot of untrained, unskilled, and in some instances, educationally disadvantaged people.

The training program had, of necessity, to be short, 13 to 16 weeks. The company hired them and they have been productive.

The employer has been the very biggest booster we have. They have gone out to other employers and said: "You people are missing the best opportunities you have right here in the valley." Just recently, Union Carbide, which is one of the hardest nuts we had to crack in the valley, has accepted trainees for mechanical mining jobs. About 10% of the trainees they accepted could not read or write when they entered training.

Union Carbide even furnished the instructors, the building, and the mine site for the training. We have found in our area that community involvement is the pressure that does the most for getting company involvement.

A satisfied customer is always your best advertiser and we have had great success with industry involvement. I don't mean it's solved all our problems. We still have them, but at least it's helping.

P. PRINCE: First, I don't think we are completely realistic on the product that we are delivering. As a job developer, I bear with the previous remark that we need to have business understanding, and that we have to have a better understanding of our own product. One of the faults in the product that we're delivering at the present time, to a large degree, is lack of staying power, meaning motivation, which has been kicked around here but hasn't been defined in terms of what it means to the disadvantaged youth going in for a job.

I feel that there must be some study as to why these youngsters want to take a job in the first place, why they stay on a job when they are placed, and what the employer must do to understand their motivations, to tap them and make them work.

One of the problems of identification here is a very subtle psychological one as to why the employer is willing to take on the youngster in the first place, as well as why the youngster wants to be taken on. I don't believe we have explored the psychology of this process adequately enough to really know the product that we're dealing with, and what is the probability of future success.

So I would like the people who are in job development to be more concerned with the quality of the product and its staying power. Because if that product does not fulfill the expectancy, the whole program goes down the drain due to employer disappointment over failure of the program to deliver.

F. PETRIE: One of the common faults that we have observed in our brief evaluations, is that our people in the Employment Service are sitting back and not visiting employers because they have a lot of unfilled job openings. Instead of grabbing a handful of applications of people that may be just a little short of employer's requirements, they sit back and do nothing.

We try to correct this by getting them out to contact employers, and sell some of the less competitive applicants that we have in our files.

Milwaukee Youth Office is trying an interesting experiment on Saturday mornings. They are having interested employers come to the office, along with social workers, parole officers and others to bring in these less competitive applicants so they can actually see the product they're trying to sell.

About July 1, we are publishing a handbook called "Managing your Manpower," which is designed for the small employer, who cannot afford large personnel staffs, to indoctrinate him with the concept of our Human Resource Development program, and to help him with some of his personnel problems, including turnover and absenteeism.

We are also rewriting our own Industrial Services Handbook, and hope to have it in the field very soon.

We are compiling our own case studies of successful HRD attempts, and we are disseminating information about the STEP program, the BIC program, and about skills advancement and other programs, which have been successful, in order that the local offices can choose those job development programs that may be best suited to work in their areas.

We are dealing with top level union officials in Washington. We are reconstituting some of our local advisory committees, and while the statistics look good on our apprenticeship center information activity, I don't think that we have really done the job we set out to do, and that is to place more minority group candidates into apprenticeship jobs.

Job Development Approaches — Influence vs. Power

G. FREITAS: I wanted Mr. Bezanson from Chicago to elaborate on his statement, which ended, I think, on an optimistic note.

I assume he meant private power as opposed to Governmental pressures. I've been involved in a few attempts at this sort of thing in San Francisco, all of which have really failed, and I would just like to hear more on his approach.

A. TERNANOVA: I'd like to get to the question of pressure, and one method versus the other.

I understand that our objective is to create change, to effect certain goals. I think we are all after the same kind of objective. In one case, it was a kind of quiet or subtle approach; in the other it is arousing public opinion and letting people generally know about it.

If we accept the fact that we are interested in achieving a goal and that pressure is going to accomplish it, I wonder what exactly is the advantage of letting it be something that is widely publicized as contrasted to the quiet approach. Why can't it be accomplished the quiet way?

In fact, a lot of our current situations are achieved behind closed doors. In most cases, this is how it is done. No one ever hears about it and it seems to be fairly effective for most pressure groups.

Barriers in Hiring

L. HOUSTON: I don't think we have actually given enough time and consideration to the idea of **community action** and job development, or the use of community pressure and power to be employed in trying to develop jobs. I think we ought to at least get away from talking about Negroes, Puerto Ricans or Mexicans, or other unemployed people as "disadvantaged," and call it by the name: they are just being discriminated against because they happen to be Negro, Puerto Rican or Mexican in this country.

One of the other comments, too, is that if we talk about it being a completely social problem, which of course means that we cannot solve it on a so-called individual basis, this only brings us back to the point where we have to begin.

I cannot recall any contract being cancelled by the federal government because an employer, or a person who has received the contract, refused to hire a Negro or Puerto Rican. I want to know what kinds of activities job developers would recommend in trying to get government to enforce its contract compliance. How can we prevent government from giving contracts to those who will not hire Negroes, Puerto Ricans or Mexicans? Because it appears to me that in our own house, we have a tool that we are not now using.

G. BULLOCK: Some two or three weeks ago, two Federal construction contracts were cancelled. One in San Francisco and one in Ohio.

Someone asked about the number of jobs that are available in this country. Government contracts create new jobs every day and I would like to see somebody in government with enough guts say: "If you want this contract, then you'll accept it the way I'm offering it, and I'm saying hire some of the people that live in that community. That's competitive bidding. If you don't like the people I'm pushing, don't bother with the contract."

The Government **does** subsidize everyone in business, whether they're running a hospital, a school system, or building airplanes or what have you. They have their hands in the tax pot.

I'm saying when we're talking about job development, let's put it right where it is. Now, business is using tax money on one hand to make it comfortable for themselves, and on the other hand, to keep the disadvantaged on welfare. I'm saying that's a situation that we are tolerating, and we should address ourselves to it.

The majority of the people here have been involved in training programs for disadvantaged youth, the 16 to 19 or 21 year-olds. But when we talk about disadvantaged people living in the ghettos and their fathers, many of them are war veterans. They can always be found when it's time to ship them to Vietnam, but when they get back we suddenly either can't find them, or they're "unskilled." In the army, they do everything from pounding typewriters to building bridges and roads. Suddenly, after the war ends, they revert to being "illiterate" and "unskilled," and they can't be found!

R. KANE: The problem of doing things quietly and doing them without causing public interest explains the lack of concern with poverty during the fifties, and the end of World War II up to the beginning of the sixties.

Poverty was there, but people didn't talk about it, and they were therefore able to push it aside and nobody did anything. I think the worst thing that we can do is to attempt to solve the problem quietly and without bringing attention to it. That is the one thing we have learned. If that is our only approach, then there will be no solution to the problem because it is too easy to forget about it.

If we do not have some kind of public support, there really is no pressure on business, or on government, or on the unions. Without such pressures, nothing happens.

Strategies for Change

A. HARRIS: If we're going to do anything at all in this area its got to be done large-scale. It is necessary to deal with the individual companies, but there are things that can be done on a broader scale that will have community-wide effect.

Now all of us are concerned with the cities, particularly the big cities, and their problems. And it seems to me that there is an approach that has not often been tried, and where it has been tried it hasn't been on a deep enough basis. You know, corporations spend an awful lot of money on institutional advertising. That includes everything from contributions to the Urban League, and the National Conference of Christians and Jews, to commercial advertising in newspapers. So I'm not terribly impressed by the fact that corporations are about to lose money by mounting new programs designed to bring in people whom they have not hired before.

Perhaps a case in point is something that took place in Newark over the last couple of years. There a group of militants in the civil rights movement threatened to picket the five downtown department stores when they found it impossible to sit down and talk with the city's other large employers about jobs for the hard-core unemployed in the city.

Now the department stores' hiring practices were pretty good; they were among the first to adhere to the new law in 1935 on fair employment, and it was a little bit misunderstood originally as to why picket lines were thrown around the department stores. But this was done for a purpose. The reason being that the big companies could be struck at only by putting pressure on the department stores, which had more to lose by this tactic.

They stood to lose the sales of good suburban customers who come in on Saturdays and other days to shop in the central city. So it was the department store heads who brought Anheuser-Busch, General Electric, the Jersey Bell Telephone Company and others to the conference table four years ago in order to bargain on jobs.

Now the first meeting they had was a rough one; it went on for two and a half hours, with everybody hollering at everybody else. But in the last ten minutes they decided it was a good idea to sit down and have another meeting.

This second meeting was important, because the employers were forced to accept their responsibility in order to avert an immediate community crisis. From that time on a program was started which now, four years later, has resulted in a widespread community efforts, with several hundred employers involved in a business and industrial coordinating council, with a couple of thousand jobs provided for hard-core people.

Someone mentioned earlier that companies can tolerate only a certain number of Negro employees. This is true in many instances, and it varies from city to city. But it also varies from month to month and from year to year. And the threshold of tolerance in 1966 is not the same threshold of tolerance for 1967. I think that we have to understand, as I'm sure we do, that employers change, and they change primarily because they're influenced by other employers.

But when employers sit down together at the table with the representatives from civil rights groups, social agencies, and with educators and others, to deal with their employment problems on a community wide basis there is an outpouring of support that comes from all the respectable elements in the community, principally their own kind. And this is where the greatest reserves lie untapped.

R. SHRANK: Let me say that some problems are sometimes more susceptible to this kind of solution. I think again it's a question of how much of the problem you want to solve.

I am very much in favor of all the training programs and they should continue. I think what OIC does is wonderful, and the kind of pattern described there is a beautiful model if it could be expanded and broadened. But if you're dealing with the big universe, the large unemployment problem of the central city ghetto, then I don't thing that you can generate enough pressure that will bring about change through subtle negotiations.

If it proves to be successful, fine. But my experience has been that it doesn't work.

At a meeting this week at Gracie Mansion with the Mayor, I heard something terribly interesting and I'll share it with you. Last summer, during our little ruckus in East New York, business in this city dropped off between 25 to 30%.

It suddenly dawned on me that the ruckus out in East New York had a lot of fringe benefits which I wasn't even aware of at the time. It has resulted in heightened activity in this town over the need for jobs.

Now, that's the answer to the question of what happens when there is public pressures.

If we don't really come up with solutions, these pressures are just going to come upon us. I think that the business community will respond very quickly, because if in fact this town becomes a deserted place and not a "Fun City" in the summertime, a lot of money involved in that kind of an operation will be lost.

I think what we have to do as job developers is to move in, as this pressure generates, as fast as we can to pick up the benefits of it and map out the concrete things that need to be done, and proposing ways that we can begin to do them.

G. FREITAS: I think we need it to have a successful program. Job development, training or what not, you have to have some kind of strength to work from, and in only a very few cases has this strength been developed. For example, Mr. Schrank talked about the problems with the unions, and a similar problem with OJT. You can't go into certain occupations under OJT because of opposition from the building trades and other unions. So I'd like him to elaborate on that.

F. BEZANSON: I'd like to try to answer that question.

I happen to agree with Mr. Schrank ideally but I guess what he's promoting is **one** way of handling pressure in a community. I agree with him too that it's a total social problem and I think we ought to look at it that way.

There are a variety of ways of getting people to do things. I have a theory, that in a power situation the formal power people may not be the people you are really dealing with, that there are other influencers.

There are some people who push buttons, and if you tackle a situation, you better find out who is calling the shots behind the scenes, or who is the big guy really making the decisions.

I guess in view of Mrs. Kane's comment, I haven't communicated too well. I don't want to be branded as too cautious. My position is that we have to use selective approaches to the use of pressure, and I think we have to be darn hard-nosed and realistic about it when we decide which way we're going to move.

My point is that if the change can be made comfortable for the employer or for the union in the long run, and if they are involved in it, it's going to work for the people that we are putting into jobs.

They would soon forget, unless they were embarrassed over it, as to how the change ever came about.

We've got to deliver a long-term, tenable situation for people in the community. We've got some examples where we have forced employers to give thirty jobs to minority groups, and six months later, they're not there any more, or maybe they're very unhappy.

The employer has got to favor it sooner or later, and I'm just saying that there are a variety of ways of producing pressure, which means getting involved in every aspect of life, social, political, religious.

R. KANE: The problem of competition I don't really think is the issue. Within competition, you have agencies that are vying for contracts with the federal government, along with some very queer rulings as to anti-discrimination policies within those contracts, which by and large are honored in the breach.

You have competition between two department stores, both selling goods to the public. You have the non-competitive situation of public utilities, which really do not want a major segment of the population to get too upset about the kind of service that is being delivered, like gas, electricity, telephone, etc. These utilities, in fact, serve the Negro community as well as the rest of the public.

But the fact is, competitors are in virtually the same situation, and either by economic boycott, by advertising, by use of the Government's power, one can make it essential that industry **does** respond. I think that a whole variety of methods can be economically feasible, either publicly or privately, by both the stick and the carrot.

W. FLYNN: I would only say that it would be pretentious on my part, or on the part of industry to say that this should be their sole defense against involvement in social activities. That would be pointless.

What I'm trying to point out is that you have to walk in an Indian's moccasins to know what he's confronted with, or what a Mr. Dewhurst is confronted with in his day-to-day activities behind the desk.

This is not to defend Mr. Dewhurst. It isn't just so simple to say: "My first concern is social responsibility, and my secondary concern is profit-making."

This is what I mean by understanding what he is confronted with, just as we have to understand what you're confronted with.

Problems of Industry in Job Development

G. POLANSKY: We talk about Second World War experience, and putting people into a tool room. This was done, it was done effectively. However, the economics of **how** it was done is far different today than it was then.

At that time, Government contracts were on a cost-plus basis. You could take a job, break it down in ten different ways, and have ten different people perform each task. Then the Government paid for it. Today, when we bid on jobs, we bid for seconds. How do we break it down? We have experts in the field trying to do this.

If we can't make a product in the shortest possible time, we're out of business. It's as plain and simple as that. If a company goes out of business while trying to be a good solid citizen to help his community, it extinguishes opportunities for hundreds or thousands of people. Business has to be a sound organization to survive.

Rather than push industry, let's look at our greater Hartford area. When the Urban League and the renewal teams came around, we met with these organizations and said: "Please fellows, get us some qualified people."

We were prepared to drop our entrance exams so we decided that if a person was willing to work, and knew how to work, that we would put him on. Well instead of being creative, these community organizations became head hunters, and instead of helping industry, they only confused industry.

I sit in an employment office every day where people come to me saying: "I want to be an apprentice tool maker." They can't read, can't write, can barely understand English. How can you work with such people in the beginning?

Let's take the vocational schools. The vocational schools have had grants under the MDTA projects to train machinists. They take twelve weeks to train a machinist. The graduates of these courses and curriculum can't read a micrometer, can't read a scale, don't know the basic concepts of the occupation. They're not taught to come to work on time.

I think the problem is how do you create this type of an environment? We have to first get to these people and orient them to work. You made the point about telling them how to dress. That's fine, but we have to look at the economic factors facing the industry as well.

T. JACQUES: I see here Mr. Polansky's problem. This is a good opportunity for industry to take the reins of this thing and work with it. So we're on a cost-plus basis, but as Mr. Schrank stated the Government is paying a lot to start with, to keep industry going.

Sure, you're going to compete for a contract on the basis of seconds. But your competitors are also competing on the same basis. And if everybody is hiring the minority groups, then what's the problem?

W. FLYNN: You're making an assumption which I think is unreal.

You're making the assumption that if everyone behaves identically, you are able to equalize competition.

The problem is that when Arrow Tool bids, first of all, it often doesn't know **who** its competitor is. It may know, but the competitor may be a larger or a smaller company than Arrow Tool, with an entirely different set of standards by which it is competing to get that particular contract. So you can't work it out on just such mathematical, precise arrangements.

If you were sitting in Arrow Tool as the president of that company, your role, in fairness to your employees, is to get that contract. Because if you don't start making a profit, your employees become a social problem in Weathersfield. If you go out of business, they are a bigger problem. So it should be understood what every institution that is trying to make a profit is faced with.

Private vs. Public Employment Potential

J. MAROI: I think one of the points that has been missed, or at least not spoken of, is the number of jobs available. It seems to me from all indications, that we have to look at the public sector to create jobs, so that the people who are disadvantaged or undereducated, or whatever, can move into a working situation where they can earn their own way. Regardless of all the fancy programs we come up with, business is not going to be prepared unless there is a profit in taking on more people than it actually needs.

All the programs that have been designed have really been aimed at meeting the needs of the employer, helping him to do a job so he can make money. Until we've solved that problem, I don't think we can look to business, and in some cases, a union, to change their ways of doing business. I submit to you we need to undergird the whole job structure with a sizable number of public sector jobs through the federal and state governments to do exactly what we are trying for.

I think we have to do job development on an individual basis, though we have to look at it as a large social problem. I think in New Haven, we have built as comprehensive a manpower program as we possibly could. We've got all the facets, and still people fall through the sieve.

"Double Standards" and Minority Hiring

R. SCHRANK: I have listened over the years to people in industry and Government talk an awful lot of flap-doodle about people not being motivated and that they really don't get in there and work. Of course, when you talk about the catastrophic failure of a good part of our civil service system here in New York City, I am very much impressed that there are an awful lot of people on our payrolls who in fact don't work.

I had an experience in New York where about four or five years ago, I placed a group of boys in one of our city institutions to work in the various maintenance departments around electricians, plumbers, etc. I considered it a useful role model.

It took a lot of negotiations to put that little program across. After the kids were there working, about two weeks later, I walked into my office, and there all twenty of them were sitting. I said, "Oh my God, now what happened?" They said, "Mr. Schrank, we want to be taken out of that place. Nobody works and we ain't learned nothing. Not only ain't we learning nothing, but if you really want to know what goes on in that place, we'll tell you." And they told me an horrendous tale of people punching other peoples time cards in, of guys going home early, of guys drinking beer around the institution. These kids were indignant because they went there to really learn a trade and they couldn't learn it because there was nobody there to teach it to them! We have a double standard — that's our trouble. We have a standard for one group of people, who are in the system. Once you're in the system you can get away with mayhem, murder or anything else.

Our whole society is like that, and all of us know it. We have all worked in those situations. When we come to the minority groups, however, we have another standard. We say, "Now this Negro kid is not motivated because he didn't show up on time." Most of **my** staff don't show up on time, and I can take you into one institution after another to witness the same situation.

My friend here from NAM knows the statistics on absenteeism in industry. We make comparisons of absenteeism in our Neighborhood Youth Corps projects on the lower East Side with some big private plants, and they compare favorably. So that there's this double-standard problem and we've got to get away from it because it's part of our frustration.

The double standard goes to work when a group of minority people come into a plant. They stand out, and the white folks who are there say, "You see, they're not motivated and they're not shaping up." But they're not looking at the other white folks, because they're not shaping up either!

As a matter of fact this is one of the things that is very well known in the ghetto community. All these kids may not read on the eighth-grade level or discuss T. S. Eliot easily, but they do know that there's a big con game going on about this issue. They are aware of the fact that there are a lot of people who aren't working and getting paid, so they're saying, "Why can't we get a little of that too?"

The View of the Disadvantaged

S. SADOFSKY: There have been a number of assumptions made by speakers which deserve a few comments. I would like to say that there are some of us who are not now in industrial positions but who were formerly in such positions.

There are assumptions, for example, that it is not top management's responsibility to employ disadvantaged or minority groups, that it's really a problem of the reactions of lower-level management and ultimately the workers, and in some cases the unions.

Well, I have been in industrial situations. I know that's so much hogwash. What top management wants, top management gets.

Number two, there are a whole variety of assumptions here that are being made about the disadvantaged and about their capabilities. When we talk about competitive advantage, the assumption is made that because you hire a Negro, you're going to lose that competitive advantage.

But we talk about the Negro as being illiterate; we talk about him as being a big social problem. We talk about him, in short, in exaggerated and negative terms. This position would be a lot stronger if industry had been hiring the disadvantaged. But I don't believe for a moment that there is any sizable outfit today, bidding for Government contracts, which could not, without a loss of its competitive edge, accept a sizable number of disadvantaged youth.

So I think that we ought to be sensitive to the way in which we relate this discussion of job development to our conception of disadvantaged people.

There are some whites and blacks alike who are probably not fit for the labor market today. This is inevitably the case. But there are a great many others, about whom we are talking, who would not constitute that kind of burden to industry.

IV. NEW DIMENSIONS IN JOB DEVELOPMENT

Remarks of Dr. Sar Levitan:

I can report to you that, from personal experience, job development does work.

What have we really done as far as job development is concerned? I think it's really a very fuzzy concept. I think we have to be realistic. We will always have hewers of wood in our society, and it doesn't have to be done at $1.25 an hour in our productive system. Still, there will be some who will remain behind, because if you are going to have an average, I understand some have to be below the average and some are above unless you have a perfect equalitarian society, and I don't believe that we are talking about that.

What have we really done about job development?

Let's look at present tactics. Since we are talking about dimensions, I think tactics is the proper word to add to the sentence.

Let's look at three groups that we have discussed this morning in one way or another. First, to the public sector. There, as I understand it, what we are trying to do, not only in the public sector but also to some extent in the private sector, eliminate the credentials trap.

Now what does that really mean? Does it mean that we will hire less qualified people rather than more qualified people? Will this really do any good for the public sector of the economy which is performing vital work?

Is it going to do any better for the growing and crucial part of our economy? I really don't think you are going to resolve the problem by hiring less educated, less prepared people, by doing away with credentials.

Who will then perform the essential public services? Let's turn to the employers. We have mentioned here several programs today and there are authorities here on them, but what are the successful attempts besides the JOBS NOW in Chicago and the few other attempts?

They are very, very limited. JOBS NOW, according to a report which one of my friends here in the audience has just prepared, and from what we know in Washington, has developed 125 jobs in the City of Chicago.

In other words, employers can accept as a token a few people who are normally not acceptable to them, as part of a reaction to Watts, or as a public duty. But how much real meaning does that have?

I don't want to demean in any way Mr. Flynn's STEP attempt. But again, what it does is get a few employers to accept a few people. I don't think really we are going to solve the problems in the dimension of a million or two, in terms of job development.

I am over-simplifying the matter, but I really don't see job development as a solution to a problem that is a very pressing and real one, even in a 3.8% unemployment economy.

How about unions? Unions have a constitutional interest. There is no point in getting in people at $1.25 or $1.35 to do the same work that union people get $3.50 for.

I am in less sympathy with unions in the building trades or other apprenticeship occupations which just discriminate on the basis of color. Of course, that's just something that is not even worth discussing. But again, there is really very little that we and the establishment are doing about it, as Bob Schrank has pointed out. Since the Feds are the people who are for job development, who fund these programs, and are all good guys, they work very closely with the unions. And it isn't part of an establishment to try to antagonize an important sector and to start fighting them. So we give up easily. And again, there would seem to be very little hope that job development is going to do a job anywhere approaching the magnitude that we really need.

Dimensions for Full Employment

Well, what are the alternatives to the tactics that we have tried so far? **I think you need a full employment economy.** We forget that we can't do any of these things unless we have a full employment economy.

If we have a continuing figure closer to 3% unemployment then we can do a great deal. So the first thing that we need is a 3% unemployment economy. But I am afraid that there, too, I am doing exactly what I have accused others of doing.

I am afraid we are not going to go to a 3% economy unless, of course, Vietnam gets a little bigger. I really don't think there is much of a chance in the foreseeable future that it will go down to 3% unemployment. Three percent unemployment means a great deal of inflation.

The predominant sector in the American economy has a very strong stake against inflation and therefore we are not going to have it even if it means 4% unemployment. As a trade-off between more or less inflation, or relatively stable prices, we know which one we are going to pick.

So I really don't hope that we are going to get far in over-heating the economy, in order to reduce unemployment, so that you have employers seeking workers.

Government as Employer of Last Resort

Then let's turn to some of the other suggestions. What about the Government as employer of last resort? You know, we already have the Government as employer of last resort, not adequately but we are spending in round figures about a billion dollars now for the Government as a last resort employer.

After all, what is NYC if not the Government as employer of last resort? Or the Job Corps in a different form? It's training not employment, but it is the Government as employer of last resort. The work, experience and training program of the Economic Opportunity Act is another employer of last resort.

So are parts of MDTA and OJT. Thus we are spending closely a billion dollars for Government as employer of last resort.

So the Government as a last resort is an answer possibly to the immediate needs of the individuals in providing some kind of income.

New Dimensions

Well, where then can we really be a little more helpful, or what programs can be more effective? Instead of the Government wasting a billion dollars, or part of the billion dollars as employer of last resort, it's spending $60 billion for what we call very good work under contract with American industry.

Now you can do a great deal with this $60 billion as an employer of last resort if you could eliminate discrimination, but several have already said this morning that the Government, despite the laws that we have passed, apparently is not going to enforce the nondiscrimination clauses.

Discrimination Problems

To be a little learned, let me give you a few figures. The $60 billion Government defense contracts are with some 75,000 firms who employ 26 million people. Now this is quite a lot of money. You would think that if the Government really means to eliminate discrimination, you would spend a little bit of money so that discrimination is eliminated.

One way to see to that is to hire people to police the anti-discrimination program. Now, according to figures which I have, and I think they are right, for policing the 75,000 employers with 26 million workers, the Government has 220 full-time compliance officers and a few hundred more part-time compliance officers.

Dividing the numbers into $60 billion with computers, you will get millions of contract dollars per each compliance officer. Unless they are really supermen, I don't see how they can carry their policing mission out. What I am saying is that the Government has really not made an effort to eliminate discrimination.

Income Maintenance Plus Part-time Work

Well, is it entirely a hopeless case? I don't think so. I would suggest at least two areas where we can do a great deal of job development: One place is in the welfare system, which we all know serves as a "disincentive" to work.

Of course, except now in New York City where they have started some changes, the welfare system for most of the country is such that if you get any work, the earnings are deducted from the relief payments, amounting to a 100 percent tax on income.

We don't even have a 100% tax for millionaires. Now if I were on relief, and were a rational person, I would rather stay on relief than accept a part-time job.

Relief clients have to go into rather low paying jobs where the difference between the hourly rates and what they could get on relief is very small. And if you get a job which covers all your relief, then you lose the relief again.

A mother with children to care for may be forced to leave the job, and it becomes very difficult to get back on relief.

Now one thing that we can do is along the lines of the Administration's proposed amendment to the Social Security Act.

It may not be adequate, and we can haggle over the cost, but it provides that a family on relief should be allowed to keep $150 a month before it loses any part of its relief entitlement.

If Congress would pass that, it would be a spur to develop jobs.

With that kind of a law, you create potential part-time jobs and domestic jobs. Although they are not glamorous they would improve the lot of hundreds of thousands of people.

Subsidy for Employers

Finally, I think we can do much more with employers. I would not exhort employers that it is their duty; of course it is their duty, and as good citizens they want to do something. But then you cannot hire too many JOBS NOW types. You have union contracts, you have all sorts of obligations. The complications are very real, and I really don't see how you can undertake it on a mass basis. But I would, and this is something which liberals for some reason do not go for, bribe employers to hire disadvantaged works.

We do that now, you'll tell me, in the Federal programs under OJT. There we don't call it bribing; we call it "reimbursement" for the extra expenses employers incur for hiring disadvantaged workers. So we pay them anywhere from $10 to $25 a week, which is becoming standard for the extra expenses.

OEO is going in now for an experiment in insurance related to job training. It works for FHA; why not in human resources?

But I would simply give an employer bonus for hiring a disadvantaged worker. What we do now under OJT is compensate or reimburse an employer and then we let him choose anybody he wishes. Under these circumstances, he does what any sensible employer would do: he hires the best qualified. So what you are doing is reimbursing him for hiring the best qualified worker, whom he would most likely hire anyway.

If we really want a program to help the disadvantaged, we would have OJT to reimburse employers for training those whom public policy wants them to hire, namely, people eligible for the Job Corps, or NYC, or one of the other programs.

Remarks of Senator Mervyn M. Dymally

"After Watts"

There are two Watts: the Watts proper that the Negro knows and which the 1960 census puts at 64,000 people within a few blocks. That's the Watts that none of us wanted to identify with before the riot. Now including polititions like myself, we talk about representing Watts; and then there is the other Watts, the Watts that the Governor circled on his curfew map, and that includes part of the Negro middle class, which is very offensive to them that they should be included in the Watts area.

There are also 14 other Watts in California: Hunters Point, San Francisco, Sleepy Hollow, San Diego, West Oakland, etc.

I think what is important in Watts now is a new spirit and a new kind of attitude where people in California are beginning to communicate.

I think this is one of the things the riots did. It made people and the Negro representatives aware of the real meaningful problems. What happened in Watts, and in all the Watts in the United States, is that while we talked about job discrimination, we never talked about job opportunities.

When we talked about integrated classrooms, we never talked about quality education, and when we talked about fair housing, we never talked about decent low-cost housing. So the middle-class person was the recipient of our efforts in the Congress and in the streets. The poor guy did not get the benefits from this movement and that's why it is considered dead these days.

Self Help

In the other Watts, we have Operation Bootstrap, which consists of a group who participated in the riot and who got together and decided to do something for themselves. They have since resisted any federal or state interference and have refused any Federal money, a kind of courageous gesture you don't hear of these days.

They have gone to employers who contributed machines and technical assistance, and they are training people. This is not in the real Watts proper but in the Central Avenue district.

Then of course we have the Neighborhood Adult Participation Program, which is an OEO funded program that hires indigenous people to work in communities. That's the overview.

State Legislative Role

We have neglected to talk about the legislative responsibility in this area. I sometimes get the impression from some of you that you don't have legislatures in your states.

But I think we need to be talking about this problem: what can the legislatures do? One of the things they can do, for instance, is enact legislation to prevent employers from asking if applicants were ever arrested.

I'll tell you why they should not be asking such a question. The Supreme Court has ruled in some instances that many of the arrests taking place down South are unconstitutional, and there were the arrests of young Northern men and women who must now go back to their communities and must answer these questions on city, county, state and federal exams.

Incidentally, of the first twelve graduates of our Skill Centers, eleven had arrest records and employers hired them because of this change of attitudes. So we need to take care of that problem.

We could enact legislation to seal the records of a parolee who has served his time and has readjusted to society after a period of two, three or five years. We could enact legislation to create job opportunities in Civil Service.

I subscribe to the theory that government has yet to provide services and jobs at the same time, and you can get both quality and **equality** service in government.

Ghetto Job Access

I think it is difficult to talk about job development without talking about other basic issues. We can't ignore the question of transportation.

The latter has been a big problem in Watts. When legislation was enacted creating a public transit authority, Watts was by-passed because it was served by private bus agency, although the entire section stood to benefit most from the bill. This is still a central problem: how to get a worker from Watts to the San Fernando Valley where industry is moving to?

New Careers Role

We also have to discuss the creation of new jobs, new careers. We ought to develop the aide category of jobs. We ought to have teacher aides, social welfare aides, health and recreation aides, and probation aides. Who could be a better probation aide than a guy who came from Juvenile Hall?

I think this should be a function of government. But private industry budgets four or five million dollars for advertising. How much better public relations they could create in a community by budgeting a couple of million dollars to create new job opportunities? It seems to me that this would be worth all the publicity that Madison Avenue could pour into our television and radio sets.

Private Industry's Role

Industry has a responsibility. You just can't say that the only purpose of being business is the profit motive. It has a responsibility to the community too because the community for some reason buys its products even though the community is sometimes victimized by the makers of the product.

Role of Unions

The unions need to create similar new career job opportunities. Moreover unions are not poor; they have enough resources to create business agent aides or assistants or trainees.

Role of Present Institutions

And finally, I think we have to begin to critically examine our institutions.

There are lots of people out in Cincinnati and in Watts, in San Francisco and in Harlem, who think that the system is bad. So we've got to stop defending the institution and start to look at them. We need a change in our attitudes.

I think the universities have a tremendous responsibility in this area. What kind of people are we sending out of the classroom who become personnel directors or vice-presidents in charge of public relations?

DISCUSSION

A Basic Philosophy

C. SOFFEL: I found it somewhat curious that a man introduced as a manpower specialist, speaking to a group of professionals who are concerned with the employment problems of the poor, should spend so much time defending the institutions and the attitudes which have traditionally kept the poor in a depressed economic status. The whole point of Dr. Levitan's talk was to explain exactly why it was quite reasonable for this society to oppose every effort, both individual and programmatic, to give the poor access to the means of wealth.

Dr. Levitan defended the right of employers to "cream" from the ranks of the poor on the ground that it was normal administrative good sense.

He also said that, in the public sector, the use of "less qualified" people (no elaboration given) would actually be a disservice to the community, since service would deteriorate. So much for the New Careers concept.

I suggest that the image of the NYC kid being paid $1.25 for work that a union member performs for $5.00 or $6.00, should evoke sympathy not for the union member, but for the kid.

It has been indicated that a possible solution was a national policy of full employment (3% unemployment ceiling). However, it was qualified by the suggestion that such a policy would undermine **everybody's** wages.

The suggestion to let welfare recipients earn pin money is abhorent in its implications. Dr. Levitan indicated that such a policy would allow mothers to take part-time jobs, and thereby encourage thrift and ambition. It would not, of course, threaten the sanctity of the present wage structure, which Dr. Levitan seemed so intent on protecting. It would not even **begin** to approach the problem of unemployed male heads-of-households. All it would do would increase the number of maids, baby-sitters and cleaning women, those essential services needed by the middle class.

I further suggest that until this society acknowledges the rights of the poor, and its obligations to secure and protect those rights, no governmental policies of policing or bribing will be able to solve the problems of poverty.

The Role of Planning

H. HARRIS: Let me offer you a very practical situation relevant to job development. A certain company in our area is going to install some very elaborate automated equipment within the next six months. It now employs 5,000 people, half of whom will lose their jobs.

What happens to job development in situations of this kind? We are in the Bridgeport area, an economy where 40¢ out of every dollar depends upon defense contracts or defense related activities, and the multiplier effects of defense investment.

If peace should break out in Vietnam — and our fluctuations in employment and unemployment have been perhaps as sharp as anywhere in the United States, after World War I, World War II, and after Korea. I'm not in any way minimizing the very effective things that can be done on a day-to-day basis in terms of training and job development or in assisting minority groups and others among the poor to equip themselves for jobs in the labor market. But I do submit that if we only focus upon the immediate, we will be in the position of people who try to win a war by focusing upon the tactical to the exclusion of strategic considerations.

S. LEVITAN: I don't want to be against planning but I again refuse to be scared by the situation you describe.

Certainly, for the 2,500 people affected, it is a very real problem. But this is a problem we face daily. A few years ago, it was South Bend, a national situation where 7,000 jobs were lost, and everybody was saying that South Bend was going to be a depressed area.

If you are going to have a 3% unemployment economy, I would promise you, that 90% of your 2,500 will be employed immediately, and for the others, some adjustments would be needed through training programs, etc. I still don't see that you need a great deal of planning for that type of problem.

They are daily problems which we are meeting every day, and they are soluble.

Goals of Job Development

B. STEIN: A 3% unemployment economy might be visionary, but we should talk about a fiscal policy aimed in the direction of a 3% economy,

complemented by a manpower planning policy. If at the same time we see prices rising, and then react by telling our legislators we've got to upgrade the supply of labor by increased training to reduce the pressure on prices, and to improve the efficiency of the labor market — for example, by having a decent U. S. Employment Service instead of the patchwork pattern we have now — then we're moving in the direction which satisfies at least one goal, which is more jobs.

I've heard a lot of answers here; I haven't heard questions. What are we trying to accomplish? I have just a short list of possible goals, and to achieve them, different means are required.

Do we want greater social mobility, which may involve displacing some to give jobs to others? Do we want more jobs for everybody? More jobs just for the poor? Or more jobs just for poor Negroes? Or greater income for the poor?

If we take the fifth goal for example, then the focus on jobs need not be so total, and income maintenance schemes or combinations of part-time jobs plus income maintenance, as Dr. Levitan suggested, become extremely promising. I would, therefore, suggest that we think in terms of the question we want to answer rather than in terms of answers.

Employer Training Insurance

G. BULLOCK: Dr. Levitan, could you explain very briefly what the insurance proposal of OEO is all about?

S. LEVITAN: Simply stated, it is an insurance system by which employer outlays for training a worker would be reduced. The costs would be reduced in the event the worker does not stay with the job.

In other words, when an employer hires an unskilled worker today he has to train him. Now he assumes a risk by taking on a "disadvantaged" worker. But if the worker leaves, let's say after six months, the employer gets a certain reimbursement for his investment in training the worker for which he does not get the full return.

If the worker leaves after three months, the reimbursement is larger, etc. I don't know how it will work out, and I am sure it will vary of course from job to job. With some jobs, you need only a week's training.

R. KANE: I think you might be interested to know, that in the first two cities contacted on this program, the employers had the good sense to say they weren't interested.

The description of the people who will be served includes 18 years of age and above, and that covers a pretty broad area. If I were an employer, I could get placement for an 18 year old college student, high school graduates, or a whole variety of others without having to pay for his hire.

Dimensions for Upward Mobility

S. ROSEN: I want to make one or two comments. First, I don't think Dr. Levitan was honest with this question of the probable level of unemployment, and I think Mr. Harris was quite in order in raising the prospect of higher levels of unemployment.

We went through substantial periods of unemployment without quite knowing what to do about it and to a greater or lesser extent, the Vietnam war has come to the rescue of the unemployment figures, which means that the Government as employer of last resort includes an uncounted number of conscripts who are not in the labor force because they are in the military. I think this is a real problem and the dilemmas alluded to are legitimate ones to talk about.

There is something else that troubles me much more, and that is a kind of reversal of the priorities I consider important. The problem is not with the hewers of wood and drawers of water, or the way in which employers afford lower levels of productivity as rates go down. I think those are rational adjustments that employers do make.

What troubles me is the degree to which the status order of employability remains fixed in the society which tells the hewers of wood and the drawers of water that they will never be anything else. The credentials operate to reinforce and perpetuate many of these barriers.

Senator Dymally talks about the social utility of aides of various kinds. Our union represents a great many people in New York City, and I would like to raise with both of you the question of what happens to an aide one, two, five or ten years later, and what kind of provision can one invent and implement, that will gradually erode the distinctions that may have been inherent in conditions of education, social background, etc.

This is what we confront in the city service and with the people whom I represent, and this is what the bulk of my work in the union is taken up with, i.e., undoing and altering this kind of order, so that while opportunity may be maldistributed for perfectly understandable reasons at the entry level, there is no reason in the world that I can understand why it should forever be maldistributed.

We cannot systematically scrutinize some of the credentialing arrangements which very often serve to keep people from graduating from status A to status B, from the nonprofessional to the semi-professional, or from the semi-professional to the professional.

We responded in the early sixties to what we thought was the manpower crisis by a great many programs which had as their objectives to make the unemployable employable, and then to bribe employers in various ways to accept people at entry level. But we really have not thought through the question of what happens once entry level employment is achieved.

With a 3% economy it's not hard to achieve that kind of employment and maintain it, but it is hard to deal with the built-in problems of people who have just caught on either because they fill the lowest jobs in the hierarchy, or because the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps or OEO has arranged for them to start at the entry level.

Now in New York City, we have proposed making the public services into a laboratory in which to experiment with what I shall call decredentializing of certain career requirements for people.

This does not mean that we think standards of performance are to be lowered; on the contrary. We think that they ought to be kept high, and in fact raised. We think it is possible to restructure jobs of doctors, nurses, engineers, and others in order to make viable careers plausible for people who lack the full array of credentials that qualify them for the conventional kind of entry or promotional opportunities that the existing system provides and which are biased in favor of a middle-class background.

What we hope to try in New York, and what we commend to your attention if it's possible or plausible, is to connect these two questions: the question of job development directly to the question of career development. Young Negro men and women have told me repeatedly that because of the work that our union is doing in providing a career ladder for upward progress in hospitals, hospital aide jobs are no longer "nigger" jobs.

We are going to do the same thing in department after department of this city, God and the Civil Service Commission willing. I think we are going to get some cooperation in that job development cannot be divorced from career development. Career development seems to me to be the next step in what I would call a rational manpower strategy for this society, since it connects the two.

It makes the hewers of wood willing to be hewers of wood because there is a future beyond that if they have the motivation.

SENATOR DYMALLY: You have put it so well that I can only agree. New careers need not be dead-end jobs, but I think we have to recognize there are certain limitations.

I think the big problem is that local, county, state and federal governments, are either unwilling or unable to cope with this problem.

It seems to me that if we could find the money — to fight the war in Vietnam, and to go to the moon, then certainly we ought to be able to find the money to develop these new careers. It is curious that the planners in Washington, D. C., and the committee chairmen, and the President's advisors have not come up with such a plan. To me it is such a simple thing it could almost be solved overnight with a proper budget and adequate money. If nothing else, at least give some hope to the disadvantaged that there is an opportunity.

S. LEVITAN: Now the question is how do you get your client, the nurse or the aide, into a higher job? I would say that I don't need any job developers, or your union, with all due respect to it. All I need is a demand for nurses which Medicare, Medicaid and other sorts of programs are going to create. Then I am perfectly willing as a taxpayer to create the institutions that will teach them and train them. I think, then, you're not to confuse this as a closed society, in that once you start as an entry, that's where you end.

S. ROSEN: The nursing shortage in New York is a shortage of long standing. Yet in the nursing schools in New York City, the enrollment is over-whelmingly white, while potential Negro candidates which we know from first hand experience, are ready and willing to become nurses. We're making nurses aides out of ghetto girls instead of nurses, because that's the only way that we can do it, due to deep-rooted institutional barriers to upward movement.

Social Planning

G. BULLOCK: We can assume that somehow or other the labor market will absorb these youths in a few years, and once they reach ages 21 to 24, they won't be unemployed. But we can also assume that they will be underemployed, that they will occupy "nigger" jobs, that they will work in menial jobs. So if we train these people before the prime age of getting into the labor market, they will go in at age 21 to 24 as highly skilled people. That is the idea of the social revolution.

We will have trained Negroes entering on a competitive basis, which means there will be a sifting out of a new group of unemployables at the bottom, people who have reached what is called their level of incompetence and are not performing well. To avoid this whole situation, therefore, we've got to have social planning if it is to be a step forward.

Inadequate Resources

D. DIAMOND: I think one of the greatest problems here of our frustration and our difficulty — I'm surprised it hasn't been mentioned before in more concrete terms — is that we're trying to split an atom with a pea shooter. We're just not putting the resources to this problem that we should.

Let's face it. Whether we like it or not, money or the economic aspect is going to move this economy and we're going to push back these barriers of discrimination only with resources. We're spending $27-$29 billion on Vietnam, and we're lucky if we can get $2 billion for the Poverty Program. We've got to move into the area of the Government being an employer of last resort, and the sooner we realize that this is a massive problem that needs massive attention, the better. I can remember back into the depression of the thirties, the way we went about solving that problem was to have forty-five or fifty other programs, and I'm not against them. But the only way that we finally **did** get around to solving it, and we did it involuntarily, was to get into a war which gave us the series of massive deficits that brought the economy back up to full employment.

Well, the way that we're going to solve this problem also is in a massive way, and we've just got to get around to thinking of this as a massive problem that needs a massive assault.

If we can spend $27 billion on Vietnam, this problem is worth $50 or $60 billion.

Manpower and Redevelopment

A. MICKENS: So many of us seem to be anxious to deal with the local and mechanical problems of job development, the problems of recruitment and training, the transportation problem, etc. We have really not followed through on the critical question of full employment in its close relationship to the whole job development process.

In fact, studies have already shown that job training and all the panoply of efforts at "upgrading" the labor force do not work very well out of the context of a tight labor market. In the absence of a tight labor market, the effectiveness of job training drops off very sharply.

I think a second point that was not adequately examined concerned the metropolitan dispersal of jobs. In a society with as highly a mobile population as ours, in which there is a considerable movement between urban labor markets, we must be careful not to become too preoccupied with mechanical problems when dealing with employment.

In this kind of context, therefore, it's curious that we can spend so much time discussing YOC centers, or the progress certain projects around the country are making, while job decentralization from the cities into suburban areas seem to render these activities futile gestures.

Thus job developers dote on the problems they can manage, after a fashion, e.g., the problems of make-shift transportation, recruitment and training. This approach shifts the burden of adjustment onto the backs of the poverty population. But we must soon come to grips with the fact that the bulk of the American population, in contrast to 1960, now lives in the suburbs.

In tandem with the population shifts, are the shifts in jobs and industrial investment to suburban areas. But what about the suburbanization of the Negro?

Are we going to accept the central city ghetto as his natural habitat, that is supposed to grow by congested leaps and bounds inside the central cities, or are we going to talk about the real problems of relocation and ghetto dispersal? Is the Negro, like the rest of the working population, going to be able to move to the suburbs where jobs are increasing more rapidly? Or are we really going to soothe ourselves with more discussions about the relative merits of JOBS NOW projects? I see job development for the disadvantaged running smack into the multiple problems of urban housing segregation and discriminatory hiring processes operating inside metropolitan labor markets.

Until we can come to grips with these things, it's rather futile to talk about the problems of "handicapped" youth.

The Potential of the Public Sector

S. ARONOWITZ: I think there is at least a reasonable doubt that the private sector will be a genuinely large area, particularly private manufacturing sectors, for substantial job development in the coming period.

I'm not talking about the increase in productivity or automation, or even the other technological factors, I'm talking about the economic situation. If we develop a job strategy which bases itself on a constant employment outlook, and we assume the past is going to carry over into the future, then I think we have one strategy; if, on the other hand we try in our discussion of jobs, to look at the actual situation, I think we're going to find ourselves in a different strategy.

And I'd just like to indicate some of the variables that may go into this strategy. Now I think it doesn't really matter whether we're talking about a favorable employment outlook in manufacturing, or an unfavorable one. In either case the central city is not going to be a place for manufacturing employment, and that means that we're going to have to look at mass transportation, as part of a strategy of job development.

Manufacturing in the city of New York holds no substantial job development possibility. There are a few jobs here and there, but manufacturing is declining, and declining precipitously in central cities, especially in our largest manufacturing industry in New York City, the garment industry. Over the next ten years it is going to experience up to a 25 percent reduction.

Changes in Urban Centers

On the other hand, inner cities are becoming commercial centers. That means that the building trades and the distributive industries are the ones to which we'll have to look for job possibilities in the manual sector. In the building trades and the distributive industries the problem is only partially the employer. It very heavily revolves around those who control the job market.

The trade unions pose a problem that I think will have to be given very important considerations in any discussion of job strategy. Nobody has found an answer. But I think the answer partly resides in the willingness of municipal administrations, as well as of voluntary organizations to enforce existing laws. The law does provide ways and means for making sure that there are integrated work crews on construction jobs.

Finally, this probably leads us to the fact that, apart from the building trades, the distributive and transportation industries, and other selected private sectors, that we have a major responsibility in the creation of jobs in the public sector.

It's in the public sector that I think we have the most political leverage. This raises the question of social priority. It's obvious that we have a public sector amounting to an annual $125 billion dollars nationally. But the social welfare component is not very large. Including the Veterans Administration, it's no more than 12 billion.

So there is the possibility that we may have to look to a reallocation of our priorities so that "disadvantaged" people can gain access. These will be job-creation possibilities.

I think therefore, that one of the major elements has got to be more serious labor-market analysis; that we should not concentrate on the microareas until we have at least gotten some indication of the micro-area potential. It's important that we not go hat in hand to certain dead-end industries that spurred development of MDTA and other kinds of training programs, that have no future in the inner city, but instead concentrate on those industires and sectors of the economy that are in fact expanding. That way

industries and sectors of the economy that are in fact expanding. That way

The Problem of Public Transportation

S. BERNSTEIN: I think we all recognize the reality that Mr. Aronowitz alluded to, the movement of industry to the suburbs. There has to be a way of getting ghetto workers to suburban workplaces and therefore the question comes up, what are we doing in the way of transportation in order to facilitate ghetto job access?

B. COLE: I should like to comment particularly on the lack of jobs in the inner city. It makes a lot of sense to look at public transportation, and the problem of getting a guy to a job out in the suburbs located two hours away from his door. But with a chance to build industrial parks in these inner cities, I think we ought to address ourselves to how do we get the kind of favorable tax climate that the rural south has had for years to attract industry, to encourage industry to come back into our inner cities.

Let me give you one example. We have a tenting manufacturer, of a hundred-year old company, who's about to build a second plant. He's been considering moving out to Iowa to take advantage of cheaper labor cost and favorable tax relief. But he also considered the fact that the kind of em*ployees he wanted* exists in abundance in neighborhoods in the inner city of Chicago. He needs a government contract.

Under the Labor Surplus Law you can get a certain amount of these contracts without being the low bidder if you are in a labor surplus area. But the law confines aid to the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. There are a dozen neighborhoods where the unemployment rate would perhaps run up to 20 percent, and even 50 percent of young adults.

Now if we could get that law changed so that any neighborhood of 50,000 or so with deep and continuing unemployment problems could be defined as a labor surplus area, we might well start industry moving back into the city. If we could further get the kind of local, state and federal tax relief that would make it advantageous to move industry back in, to relocate jobs where people are, instead of having to wrestle with the urban transportation problem for ghetto residents, we could enable people to walk to work, or use local transportation.

Employer of Last Resort

R. KANE: As for the question of the Government as employer of last resort, it seems to me that somebody is very much missing the temper of the ghetto and the mood of all the minorities, certainly the Negroes to a greater degree.

I do not think that the temper of the unemployed is any longer interested in jobs of last resort. I don't think they want those jobs. I think that the turnover rate in the Neighborhood Youth Corps indicates that even the 16 and 17 year olds, who are least employable, are no longer interested in jobs that offer them no opportunity for mobility.

If we're talking about job development and job creation, it must be the kinds of jobs that people want, otherwise we might just as well stop developing jobs, since nobody is going to be willing to take them. I think we are very close to that point now.

I think that we have not wrestled with the facts of the real world, which is moving very rapidly, and not merely with respect to jobs.

PUBLICATIONS PREPARED BY

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK **NEW YORK UNIVERSITY**

PROGRAM COMPONENTS SERIES

EDUCATIONAL DEFICIENCIES OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH — TITLE I ESEA, 1965
by JAMES E. MAUCH and FRIEDA DENEMARK
U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 23 pages.

THE YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTERS OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICE
by HARRY KRANZ
Bureau of Employment Security, Washington, D.C., 24 pages.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES IN YOUTH-WORK PROGRAMS
by JOSEPH L. WEINBERG
Jewish Vocational Service, Newark, New Jersey, 20 pages.

JOB DEVELOPMENT FOR YOUTH
by GEORGE BENNETT
Action for Boston Community Development, Inc., 11 pages.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM IN THE SOLUTION OF RURAL YOUTH MANPOWER PROBLEMS
by J. EARL WILLIAMS
University of Houston, 19 pages.

INCREASING EMPLOYABILITY OF YOUTH — THE ROLE WORK TRAINING
by MARTIN MOED
City University of New York, 19 pages.

LOW INCOME YOUTH, UNEMPLOYMENT, VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND THE JOB CORPS
by FRANCIS P. PURCELL
San Francisco State College, 24 pages.

Series $2.50

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SERIES

LOWER-CLASS DELINQUENCY AND WORK PROGRAMS
by JOHN M. MARTIN
Fordham University, New York City, 26 pages.

EMPLOYABILITY AND THE JUVENILE "ARREST" RECORD
by EDWARD V. SPARER
Columbia University, New York City, 14 pages.

WORK PROGRAMS AND THE YOUTHFUL OFFENDER
by EDWARD COLE
Greater Cleveland Manpower Advancement Program, 18 pages.

Series $1.25

PLANNING SERIES

POPULATION DATA AND COMMUNITY SELF SURVEYS FOR THE PLANNING AND OPERATING OF YOUTH-WORK PROGRAMS
by JOSEPH C. LAGEY
New York University, 24 pages

GUIDELINES FOR A DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM FOR COMMUNITY PROGRAMS FOR UNEMPLOYED YOUTH
by CLARENCE C. SHERWOOD
City University of New York, 16 pages.

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS IN INTEGRATING NEEDED SUPPORTIVE SERVICES IN NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROJECTS
by MARK BATTLE
Bureau of Work Programs, Washington, D.C., 8 pages.

THE COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY'S ROLE IN COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER PROGRAMS — PLANNING AND PROBLEMS
by ROSLYN D. KANE
Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C., 27 pages.

Series $1.75

PARTICIPATION OF THE POOR SERIES

PARTICIPATION OF THE POOR
by BRENDAN SEXTON
UAW Leadership Studies Center, Detroit, Michigan, 12 pages.

THE NONPROFESSIONAL WORKER IN YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS
by SEYMOUR LESH
National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York City, 16 pages.

A VIEW OF THE POVERTY PROGRAM: "WHEN IT'S DRY YOU CAN'T CRACK IT WITH A PICK"
by TOM HAYDEN
Newark Community Union Project, 22 pages.

Series $1.25

WORKSHOP SERIES

1. **SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS: WORKSHOP ON PROBLEMS OF PLANNING, RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION FOR YOUTH-WORK PROGRAMS**
   held December, 1965, 42 pages.
   $ .50 each
2. **SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS: WORKSHOP ON THE IMPACT OF A TIGHTENING LABOR MARKET ON THE EMPLOYABILITY AND EMPLOYMENT OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH**
   held April, 1966, 32 pages.
   $ .50 each
3. **SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS: WORKSHOP ON NONPROFESSIONAL CAREERS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH**
   held December, 1966, 141 pages.
   $1.00 each
4. **SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS: WORKSHOP ON JOB DEVELOPMENT FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH**
   held June, 1967, 105 pages.
   $1.00 each

RESEARCH REPORTS

NEGRO YOUTH AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

by STANLEY SADOFSKY, MELVIN HERMAN, JOSEPH BENSMAN, ROBERT LILIENFELD AND CATHERINE MANOS
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University

PHASE I — A study of 601 Negro youths who applied for work at Intake Centers.

PHASE II — A study of 201 Negro youths not placed on jobs or training within three months after application.

Series $ .75

RESEARCH REPORTS IN PREPARATION

PHASE III — A study of 412 Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees who have been in the Corps at least three months.

PHASE IV — A study of the characteristics and attitude of youths enrolled in the Corps who left before three months.

PHASE V — A follow-up study of youth who remained in the Corps more than three months.

Available late 1967

LEGISLATIVE SERIES

FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

by R. A. NIXON
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University, 23 pages.

LEGISLATIVE DIMENSIONS OF THE NEW CAREERS PROGRAM

by R. A. NIXON
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University, 24 pages.

Series $1.00

MANPOWER MONOGRAPHS

1. **MANPOWER PERSPECTIVES FOR URBAN REDEVELOPMENT**
   by ALVIN MICKENS
   Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University, 95 pages.

2. **IMPLEMENTING NONPROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS IN HUMAN SERVICES**
   by AARON SCHMAIS
   Yeshiva University, New York City, 80 pages.

3. **LABOR MARKET INFORMATION TO AID DEVELOPMENT OF ENTRY JOBS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH**
   by R. A. NIXON
   Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University, 85 pages.

4. **RURAL YOUTH-WORK PROGRAMS: PROBLEMS OF SIZE AND SCOPE**
   by MICHAEL MUNK
   Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University, 60 pages.

5. **NEIGHBORHOOD MANPOWER PROGRAMS**
   by MAURICE MEZOFF
   Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University, 50 pages.

6. **COUNSELING SERVICES FOR UNEMPLOYED YOUTH**
by WILLIAM BINGHAM
Rutgers State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 65 pages.

Monographs $1.00 ea.

BOOKS

YOUTH-WORK PROGRAMS: PROBLEMS OF PLANNING AND OPERATION
by MELVIN HERMAN AND STANLEY SADOFSKY
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University, 208 pages.

$2.95
New York University Press

BOOKS IN PREPARATION

YOUTH, WORK AND UNEMPLOYMENT — A BOOK OF READINGS
edited by MELVIN HERMAN AND STANLEY SADOFSKY
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University.
BERNARD ROSENBERG
City University of New York.

Available late 1967,
Thomas Crowell, Inc., publishers

DECISION MAKING IN POVERTY PROGRAMS: CASE STUDIES FROM YOUTH-WORK AGENCIES
by MELVIN HERMAN AND MICHAEL MUNK
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University.

Available Spring, 1968
Columbia University Press

ORDER FROM
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH
Graduate School of Social Work
New York University
853 Broadway
New York, New York 10003